

The Classical Review

DECEMBER 1895.

CRITICAL NOTES ON CLEM. AL. *STROM.* VII.

(Concluded from page 390.)

§ 46, p. 858. οὐδὲν ἐπιζητεῖ τῶν κατὰ τὸν βίον εἰς τὴν ἀναγκαίαν χρήσιν οὐδ' ὅτι οὖν. The reading of the MS. is οὐθ' ὅτ' οὖν, for which H. conjectures εὐθετούντων, the last syllable having been lost by its resemblance to the penultimate.

Ib. p. 859. ὅσοις δὲ βρήκουσά τις ἐτι ὑπολείπεται γωνία κάτω ῥέπουσα, κ.τ.λ. Put a full stop before ὅσοις, and read perhaps ἀγωνία, comparing *Il.* xxi. 385 ἔρις βεβριθυία.

Ib. καθάπερ τῷ λίθῳ τὸ βάρος, οὕτως τὸ οὐδὲ ἢ ἐπιστήμη ἀναπόβλητος· οὐκ ἀκουσίως <γὰρ>, ἀλλ' ἐκουσίως, δυνάμει λογικῇ καὶ γνωστικῇ καὶ προνοητικῇ καθίσταται. Read τῷδε for τοῦδε. H. proposes to omit the interpolated γὰρ and the colon after ἀναπόβλητος, and to put a comma before καθίσταται.

§ 47. ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ μὴ ἀποβληθῆναι δι' εὐλαβείας ἀναπόβλητον γίνεται, τῆς μὲν εὐλαβείας...ἀνθέξεται. Read ἐπεὶ and ἀποβληθέν. [So H.]

Ib. πεπεισμένος καὶ ὡς ἔστιν ἕκαστον τῶν μελλόντων κέκτηται τοῦτο. Put καὶ before κέκτηται.

Ib. οὐ γὰρ ἢ τῆς σοφίας μετάδοσις κινούντων καὶ ισχόντων ἀλλήλους τῆς τε ἐνεργείας καὶ τοῦ μετίσχυοντος γίνεται οὐτε ἀφαιρουμένου τινὸς οὐτε ἐνδεοῦς γινομένου. Put commas before κινούντων and before and after γίνεται, and read μετέχοντος, as in the preceding sentence. The form μετίσχυοντος is probably due to ισχόντων just before. For οὐτε...οὐτε H. restores the οὐδὲ...οὐδέ of the MS.

§ 48. οὐκὼν ἀφέλοιτο <ἄν> τούτους. I NO. LXXXIII. VOL. IX.

think ἄν is more likely to have been lost before οὐν than where it has been inserted by Dindorf. H. queries τιμώμενός τε in the following sentence.

§ 48. ὡς δὲ ὁ ἱατρὸς ὑγίειαν παρέχεται τοῖς συνεργούσι πρὸς ὑγίειαν, οὕτως καὶ ὁ θεὸς τὴν αἰδίων σωτηρίαν τοῖς συνεργούσι πρὸς γνῶσιν τε καὶ εὐπραγίαν, σὺν δὲ τῷ ποιεῖν ὄντων ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἃ προστάττουσιν αἱ ἐντολαὶ καὶ ἡ ἐπαγγελία τελειοῦται. Put a full stop after εὐπραγίαν. For ὄντων H. reads ὁτιοῦν (or ἐν) τῶν. Prof. Cook Wilson would read τῶν governed by the following relative.

Ib. τὸ πᾶν συναιρεῖται πρὸς τὴν τελειότητα τὴν σωτηρίαν. We should have expected συναίρεται here, as συναίρεω does not appear to be used in a deponent sense, and provides no suitable meaning. It occurs however in p. 896 ταῖς ἡδοναῖς αὐτῶν συναιρούμενον. H. Perhaps we should read τῆς σωτηρίας instead of the accusative.

§ 49. περὶ τούτων ἄρα ὁ γνωστικὸς καὶ συνεύχεται τοῖς καινότερον πεπιστευκόσι. Read κοινότερον, the word κοινός being used of πίστις, as opposed to γνῶσις.

P. 861. κἂν ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ ταμίῳ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐννοηθῇ μόνον καὶ ἐπικαλέσθαι τὸν πατέρα, ὁ δὲ ἐγγὺς...πάρεστιν. Put a colon instead of a comma before κἂν.

Ib. τὸ δὲ ἐπιτελεῖν ἡδέα τὸν δύσσοιστον κοινόν. βίον διώκουσιν καταλιμπάνει. Dindorf reads ἡδέα after Potter for MS. διά. H. has the excellent emendation ἐν τι τελεῖν διὰ τὸ ἡδὺ τοῖς τὸν κ.τ.λ.

F F

§ 50. εἰ δὲ ἐν τῇ κρίσει τοῦ δρωντος καὶ λαλοῦντος τὸ ἀδικεῖν, οὐχὶ δὲ ἐν τῷ πάθει κείται τοῦ ἀδικουμένου. This is Lowth's emendation for διακονομένου. Perhaps we should read διαπονομένου.

Ib. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ οἷεταί. Potter suggested ὁμνῖται. H.'s ὁμείται is more felicitous.

Ib. ὁμνῖναι γάρ ἐστι τὸ ὄρκον... ἀπὸ διανοίας προσφέρεσθαι παραστατικῶς. H. suggests παραστατικῆς.

§ 51, p. 862. εὐγνωμοσύνην. Apparently copied by inadvertence from Klotz for the εὐγνωμοσύνην of the older editors.

Ib. ὁ μὲν οὖν μηδὲ ὁμνὺς πολλοῦ γὰρ δεῖ ἐπιορκῆσαι. This is Dindorf's correction of MS. ἐπιορκήσει, but πολλοῦ γὰρ δεῖ is often used adverbially. [So H.]

§ 53, p. 863. Put colons, instead of commas, after ὠφελεῖν, ἀναγκάζεται, ποιοίη. [So H.]

Ib. ὁ τοῖνυν μέχρι τῆς συμπεριφορᾶς [διὰ τὴν τῶν πέλας σωτηρίαν] συγκαταβαίνειν ψιλῆς, διὰ τὴν τῶν δι' οὓς συμπεριφέρεται σωτηρίαν,... οὗτος οὐδαμῶς ἀναγκάζεται. 'No need to omit the bracketed words, which first express the limitation in general terms, the same thing being afterwards repeated with a closer reference to prevent misunderstanding. The double διὰ is like the double ὑπὲρ below, ἐαυτὸν ἐπιδίδωσιν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὑπὲρ τῶν γνωρίμων οὓς αὐτὸς ἐγέννησεν. Instead of ἀναγκάζεται some word expressing falsehood or shrinking is required. Potter's ἀναγκάζεται seems too poetic, though it is found in Xenophon.' H. I cannot see that any misconception is avoided by the repetition, and I think it more likely that the bracketed words are a gloss.

P. 864. μηδὲ ἐν τῷ προφορικῷ λόγῳ ψεύσασθαι θέλων ποτὲ... ἐπεὶ τὸ ψεῦδος αὐτὸ ἄτε μετὰ τινος δόλου εἰρημένον οὐκ ἀργός ἐστι λόγος, ἀλλ' εἰς κακίαν ἐνεργεῖ. For αὐτὸ read αὐτῷ and put commas before ἄτε and after εἰρημένον.

§ 55. ἐστὶν γὰρ... ἡ γνώσις τελειώσις τις ἀνθρώπων ὡς ἀνθρώπων. Dindorf has carelessly followed Klotz in reading ἀνθρώπων for ἀνθρώπου.

Ib. ἡ μὲν γὰρ τί ἐστι γνώσις τοῦτο πάντως καὶ σοφία τυγχάνει. H. adopts Sylburg's emendation ταύτη.

§ 56, p. 865. ὁπόταν τις κρεμασθῇ τοῦ κυρίου. Read ἐκκρεμασθῇ, comparing *De Div. Serv.* § 3 τῆς ἐνταῦθα ζωῆς ἐκκρεμασθέντες.

Ib. ὅθεν ἐπὶ τέλει ἡ γνώσις παραδίδεται τοῖς εἰς τοῦτο ἐπιτηδεύουσιν... διὰ τοῦ πλείονος παρασκευῆς... δέσθαι. Put a colon before ὅθεν, and read [so H.] τὸ for τοῦ.

§ 56. Colons, instead of commas, after σωτήριον and αἰίοις.

§ 57. ἐνταῦθα... τῆς γνωστικῆς ψυχῆς ἡ τελειώσις, πάσης καθάρσεως... ὑπερβᾶσαν σὺν τῷ κυρίῳ γίνεσθαι ὅπου ἐστὶν προσεχῶς ὑποτεταγμένη. Read πάσας καθάρσεις (ὑπερβαίνω not being found with the genitive) and ὑποτεταγμένη: put a comma after ὅπου ἐστὶν. H.

Ib. p. 866. εἰς τὸ ἀμετάπτωτον καὶ μετ' ἐπιστήμης καταληπτικὸν παραπέμπονσα. H. restores the MS. καταληπτόν for Potter's καταληπτικόν.

Ib. δευτέρα δὲ ἡ ἐκ πίστεως εἰς γνώσιν, ἡ δὲ εἰς ἀγάπην περαιουμένη. ἐνθὲν δὲ ἡδὴ φίλον φίλῳ τὸ γνωστικὸν τῷ γνωστικῷ παρίστανται. Remove the stop after περαιουμένη. [So H. who adds 'the 2nd transition already makes the object and subject of γνώσις dear to each other by its own approach to ἀγάπη.']

§ 58, p. 866. θεὸν εἶναι τὸν σωτήρα ἀπέδειξεν... πρόσωπον αὐτὸν εἰπὼν τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακώβ, τὸν... διδάξαντα περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, διὸ καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος χαρακτῆρα τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱὸν προσεῖπεν. H. reads πατρός for πνεύματος, changing the following comma to a colon.

Ib. ἐνα δὲ εἶναι τὸν θεὸν διὰ τῶν ζητούντων τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακώβ μεμνηνται. Read τοῦ for τῶν, printing the following words (ζητούντων τοῦ Ἰακώβ) as a quotation. H.

Ib. ἡ γενεὰ δὲ τῶν ζητούντων αὐτὸν τὸ γένος ἐστὶ τὸ ἐκλεκτόν, τὸ ζητητικὸν εἰς γνώσιν. Exchange ἐκλεκτόν and ζητητικόν.

§ 60, p. 867. πάντ' ἐκεῖνα ποιῶν δι' ὧν λαβεῖν δυνήσεται τὴν γνώσιν ὧν ποθεῖ. πόθος δὲ κατὰ προκοπὴν πίστεως ἅμα ζητήσιν κραθεῖς συνίσταται, τὸ δ' ἐστὶν ἄξιον γενέσθαι τῆς τοιαύτης... θεωρίας. Bracket the words from πόθος το συνίσταται as parenthetical, changing the preceding full stop into a comma.

§ 61, p. 868. πρόεισιν οὖν ἐγγυμαζόμενος τῇ ἐπιστημονικῇ θεωρίᾳ εἰς τὸ ἐναγωνίσασθαι τοῖς καθολικώτερον... εἰρημένοις, εἰδὼς... ὅτι ὁ διδάσκων ἀνθρώπων γνώσιν... κύριος ἐστὶν διὰ στόματος ἀνθρώπινου κύριος ἐνεργῶν. For ἐναγωνίσασθαι read ἐπαγ-. [So H.] For πρόεισιν of Hervetus read πρόσκειναι with the MS. and for the second κύριος read κυρίως. H.

Ib. ὁ θεὸς δὲ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀφ' οὗ φέρεται τὸ φανεῖν καὶ βλέπειν ἐξετάζει. Should we read πνεῦμα for πρᾶγμα?

§ 62. καὶ διὴ καὶ συμπάσχει τῷ σώματι... ἀλλ' οὐ πρωτοπαθεῖ κατὰ τὸ πάθος. Put a full stop before καὶ διὴ and a colon after πάθος. H.

§ 63, p. 869. ἡ γνώσις αὐτῷ πείσμα βεβαίωτατον ἐγένετο τῆς τῶν μελλόντων ἀπολύψεως. Dindorf omits ἐλπίδων inserted in the

MS. after μελλόντων. I am rather disposed to think that it represents an ἐλπίδα lost before ἐνεγέννησεν.

§ 65, p. 870. εὖ γὰρ οἶδεν τὰ ποιητέα καὶ μὴ ἔγνωκώς κ.τ.λ. Put a comma after μὴ. [So H.]

Ιβ. ὑφίσταται ὃ δ' εἰ καὶ προσήκειν αὐτῷ ὁ λόγος ὑπαγορεύει. Read δεῖν with the first hand in the MS. H.

Ιβ. οὗτος ὁ τῷ ὄντι ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ...ὑπερβὰς ὅλον τὸν ἐμπαθῆ βίον, τοῦτ' πάντα εἰς ἐαυτὸν ἀνῆρτηται. Put a colon before τοῦτ'. [So H.]

§ 66. μὴ τι οὖν ἢ δὲ ἀγνοίαν τῶν δεινῶν καὶ μὴ δεινῶν συνίσταται ἢ δειλία. Put a question at the end. Should οὐ take the place of ἢ?

P. 871. οἱ μὲν ἀφορμὰς παρέχοντες σφίσιν αὐτοῖς ἐπιρριπτοῦσιν ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς κυδύνοις. H. would prefer to keep the MS. ἐπιρριπτοῦντες, and change παρέχοντες to παρέχουσιν, if a verb is required.

§ 67, p. 872. οὔτε γὰρ διὰ φιλοτιμίαν...οὐτ' αὐτὰ φιλοχρηματῖαν...πάθει δεινῷ τὸ ἀγαθὸν μεταδιώκοντες...ἀλλ' οὐδὲ δὲ ἀγροικίαν ἐγκρατὴς καὶ ἀγευστος ἡδονῶν οὐδεὶς κατ' ἀλήθειαν σόφρων. Insert ὦν after ἡδονῶν.

Ιβ. καιροῦ γὰρ λαβόντες παρακλέπτουσι τὸν νόμον. Either καιρὸν λαβεῖν or καιροῦ λαβεῖσθαι might stand: καιροῦ λαβεῖν is impossible. Read here καιρὸν.

§ 69, p. 873. ὀλίγα φροντίζων τῶν λεγόντων διὰ φόβον αὐτῷ δεδοκέναι. H. would read αὐτὸν, or αὐτὸν αὐτῷ.

Ιβ. εἰδέναι καὶ ὅτ' ἂν τις...καὶ ὅπως ἐπιδῶ. Read ἐπιδόη, or else omit ἂν.

Ιβ. οὐδενὶ μὲν ἀντικείμεθα λέγομεν τὸν θεὸν...πάντων γὰρ κτίστης καὶ οὐδὲν ἔστι τῶν ὑποστάντων ὃ μὴ θέλει, φάμεν δ' αὐτῷ ἐχθροὺς εἶναι τοὺς ἀπειθεῖς...οἷον τοὺς διεχθρεύοντας αὐτοῦ τῇ διαθήκῃ. For θέλει read perhaps φιλεῖ and omit the second τοῖς. Put a comma after κτίστης and a colon before φάμεν.

§ 70, p. 874. εἰκόνα ἀτεχνῶς σώζοντος ὀλίγην τῇ τῆς ἀληθείας προνοίᾳ. For ὀλίγην read ὅλην 'preserving entire the divine image.'

§ 72, p. 875. οὗτος μισθὸς γνώσεως τῷ σωτῆρι καὶ διδασκάλῳ, ὃν αὐτὸς ἤγησεν, τὴν ἀποχὴν τῶν κακῶν καὶ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς εὐποιίας. Would C. have attributed to Christ such prayers for himself? Perhaps we should insert αὐτοῖς after αὐτός with a reference to Joh. xvii. 15, 17, 18 and to 1 Cor. ix. 18.

§ 74, p. 876. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ὅπως ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν παιδευθεῖ ποτ' ἂν ὁ γνωστικός...ἀτεγκτος ἡδοναῖς γεγόμενος, οὐποτε ὑποπίπτων ἁμαρτήμασιν ἀλλοτρίων κακῶν ὑποδείμασιν οὐ παιδευέται. For τῶν αὐτῶν read with Heinsius τοιούτων, put a comma after ἁμαρ-

τήμασιν, and a full stop (instead of a comma) after παιδευέται.

§ 76, p. 877. οὗτος...κυριακὴν ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ποιεῖ ὅταν ἀποβάλλῃ φαυλὸν νόημα καὶ γνωστικὸν προσλάβῃ τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἀνάστασιν δοξάζων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅταν...λάβῃ, νομίζει κ.τ.λ. Put a comma after προσλάβῃ and a colon after δοξάζων, and read αὐτῷ for αὐτῷ.

§ 77, p. 878. ταύτῃ οὐδὲ ὄναρ ποτὲ μὴ ἀρμόζον ἐκλεκτῷ βλέπει ἀτεχνῶς. ξένος γὰρ καὶ παρεπίδημος ἐν τῷ βίῳ. I think ἀτεχνῶς is much more forcible if joined with the following sentence, as by Potter.

Ιβ. ὁ γνωστικός...τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ἀπονόσιαν ἀνταναπληροῖ...τὰ ὄρη μεθιστὰς τῶν πλησίων καὶ τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν ἀνωμαλίας ἀποβάλλων. καίτοι ἕκαστος ἡμῶν αὐτοῦ τε ἀμπελῶν καὶ ἐργάτης, ὁ δὲ καὶ πράσσων τὰ ἄριστα λαμβάνειν βούλεται τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Put the words καίτοι ἕκαστος—ἐργάτης into brackets with a comma before and after. Read αὐτοῦ for αὐτοῦ, and perhaps καταβάλλων for ἀποβάλλων. The reference is apparently to Isa. xl. 4.

Ιβ. ὅπου γὰρ ὁ νοῦς τινός, φησὶν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ θησαυρὸς αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸς ἐαυτὸν μειονεκτεῖ πρὸς τὸ μὴ ὑπεριδεῖν ποτὲ ἐν θλίψει γεγόμενον ἀδελφόν...ἐὰν ἐπίστηται μάλιστα ῥᾶον ἐαυτὸν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ τὴν ἔνδειαν οἶσοντα. Put a colon after θησαυρὸς αὐτοῦ, and perhaps change the position of μάλιστα to before ἐὰν. Dindorf would transpose νοῦς and θησαυρὸς to make the words agree with St. Matthew; but we find the same order in *De Div. Serv.* § 17, and this appears to be more in harmony with the preceding clause here προκρίνων ταῦτα ἐξ ὧν εἶναι πεπίστευκεν.

§ 78, p. 879. ἔχει γὰρ ἄκρατον πίστιν...τὸ εὐαγγέλιον δι' ἔργων καὶ θεωρίας ἐπαίνων, καὶ δὴ οὐ τὸν ἔπαινον παρὰ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καρποῦται. For ἐπαινῶν, which may have been corrupted through the following ἔπαινον, read ἐπεξιών followed by a full stop.

Ιβ. οὗτος περισπώμενος ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐλπίδος οὐ γένηται τῶν ἐν κόσμῳ καλῶν. I think the word περισπῶ is always used in a bad sense of earthly distractions. We want here an expression for the elevating influence of hope in leading a man to despise earthly honours. Perhaps we should read ἐπισπώμενος. I am inclined also to read αἰδίας for ἰδίας, but hesitate in view of the next sentence, where we find ὡς ἂν παρεπίδημος καὶ ξένος τῶν τῆδε κληρονομημάτων, μόνων τῶν ἰδίων μεμνημένος, τὰ δὲ ἐνταῦθα πάντα ἀλλότρια ἡγούμενος. In the latter sentence I should place the comma before (instead of after) κληρονομημάτων.

§ 78, p. 879. ἐξελεγμένους ὡς δίκαιοι, ἡγεμονικὸς δὲ...ὡς ὁ γνωστικός. Omit ὁ.

Ib. διὸ καὶ ἐσθίων...τὰ ἅγια ποιεῖ. Put a colon (instead of a comma) before διὸ.

§ 79, p. 880. τούτου δὲ ἡγείται τὸ εἰληφέναι τὴν γνώσιν, καὶ δὴ καὶ αἰτεῖται...τυχεῖν μὲν τῶν ἀρίστων, φυγεῖν δὲ τὰ χειρόνα. [αἰτεῖται δὲ καὶ ἐπικουφισμὸν περὶ ὧν ἡμαρτήσαμεν ἡμεῖς καὶ ἐπιστροφὴν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν,] οὕτως ὁξέως ἐπόμενος τῷ καλοῦντι κατὰ τὴν ἐξοδὸν ὡς ἐκεῖνος καλεῖ προάγων ὡς εἰπεῖν διὰ τὴν ἀγαθὴν συνειδησὶν σπεύδων ἐπὶ τὸ εὐχαριστῆσαι. Put a comma instead of a full stop before τούτου, and a full stop instead of a comma after γνώσιν. The words in brackets seem to interrupt the order of thought. The preceding clause speaks of obtaining what is best (heaven) and avoiding what is worse: the subsequent clause speaks of a prompt following of Him who calls us at our death. The intermediate clause would come more naturally after συνειδησὶν, thus supplying an easier construction for σπεύδων. Put a comma after χειρόνα and after καλεῖ, and a full stop after συνειδησὶν.

§ 80, p. 880. μετὰ τῶν ὁμοίων διάγει τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τοῖς χοροῖς τῶν ἁγίων, κἂν ἐπὶ γῆς ἐτι κατέχρηται, οὗτος...ὑπερνεφραίνεται οὐ πρῶτα μόνον ἀναστὰς καὶ μετὰ τὸν ἡμέρας...καὶ διδάσκει τὸν νῦν...εὐχαριστῶν αἰετῶ θεῷ καθάπερ τὰ ζῶα...τὰ διὰ Ἡσαίου ἀλληγορούμενα, ὑπομενητικός πρὸς πᾶσαν πείραν. ὁ κύριος, φησὶν, ἔδωκεν, ὁ κύριος ἀφείλετο. Put a full stop after κατέχρηται, and after ἀλληγορούμενα, a comma after πείραν. For μέσον ἡμέρας read perhaps μεσημβρίας.

Ib. p. 881. τὸ δὲ ὅστιον τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν δίκαια...μηνύει. ἂ δὴ ἐπιστάμενος γνωστικός ἦν. Put a comma after μηνύει and a full stop, instead of Dindorf's comma, after ἦν.

Ib. ἀσφαλὴς δὲ ἐν συμπεριφορᾷ ὁ γνωστικός μὴ λάθῃ ἢ ἡ συμπεριφορὰ διάθεσις γένηται. Insert ἔστω before ἐν, omit ἢ and read γενομένη for γένηται.

§ 81. οὐδέποτε τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἁμαρτησάντων μέμνηται, ἀλλὰ ἀφίησι...ἐν γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ τοῦτο ὧν ὁ θεὸς βούλεται, μὴ δὲ ἐν ὅς ἐπιθυμεῖν μηδὲνα μισεῖν, ἐνὸς γὰρ θελήματος ἔργον οἱ πάντες. Perhaps we should read μηδενὶ ἐπιφθονεῖν.

Ib. καὶ μήτι τὸν γνωστικὸν τέλειον εἶναι βουλόμενος ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ὡς τὸν οὐράνιον πατέρα, τοιούστιν ἑαυτὸν ὁ λέγων, δεῦτε τέκνα ἀκούσατέ μου φόβον κυρίου οὐ τῆς δι' ἀγγέλων βοήθειας ἐπιδεῖ εἶναι βούλεται τοῦτον, παρ' ἑαυτοῦ δὲ...τὴν φρονεῖν ἔχειν...διὰ τῆς εὐπαθείας. Put commas after ἑαυτόν and after κυρίου and insert ὡς before ἑαυτόν. Put a mark of interrogation after εὐπαθείας.

§ 81. ο τοιοῦτος ἀπαιτεῖ παρὰ κυρίου, [οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ αἰτεῖ.] καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πενομένων ἀδελφῶν οὐκ αὐτὸς αἰτήσεται ὁ γνωστικός, οὐ περιουσίαν χρημάτων εἰς μετάδοσιν, ἐκείνοις δὲ ὧν δέονται χορηγίαν. I am inclined to think that οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ αἰτεῖ was a marginal query. Otherwise I cannot see the force of καί. Omit the comma and οὐ after γνωστικός.

Ib. δίδωσι γὰρ οὕτως καὶ τὴν εὐχὴν τοῖς δεομένοις ὁ γνωστικός καὶ τῷ διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς ἀγνώστως ἅμα καὶ ἀτύφως παρέχεται. For τῷ read τὸ, accusative after παρέχεται.

§ 82, p. 882. αὐτίκα τοῦ ἁμαρτήσαι ἀλλότριον παριστάσα ἡ γραφὴ τοῖς μὲν παραπεσόντας τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις πιπράσκει· μὴ ἐμβλέψῃ δὲ πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν ἀλλοτρίᾳ γυναικὶ λέγουσα, ἀντικρὺς ἀλλότριον...τὴν ἁμαρτίαν λέγει. For τοῦ read τὸ comparing ἀλλότριον τὴν ἁμαρτίαν below. Put a full stop after πιπράσκει: the reference in ἡ γραφὴ is to such passages as Judges iv. 2, x. 7, Isa. l, 1, and has nothing to do with what follows.

Ib. ἐπ' ἐκεῖνο μόνον ἰέμενος, ἐφ' ὃ ἔγνω μόνον. To justify the 2nd ἐπὶ it seems necessary to transpose the two clauses.

Ib. αἰσθεται...μετατιθεῖς ἐκ δουλείας εἰς νιοθεσίαν ἀνάκολουθα τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ [μήτε] μὴ γνοὺς τὸν θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθεῖς τε πρὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τέλει πρὸς ἀξίαν τῆς χάριτος ἐνδεικνύμενος τὰ ἐνεργήματα. Dindorf brackets μήτε, and τε has nothing to correspond to it. I am disposed to think that μήτε is a corruption of οὔτε owing to the preceding -μη, and that τε should be placed after τέλει, with a comma before ἐπὶ and after ἐπιστήμῃ.

§ 83. οὐδὲ αἰσχύνεται ἀποθανεῖν εὐσυνειδήτους ὧν ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ὀφθῆναι, πάντας...τοὺς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποκεκαθαρμένους σπύλους ὃ γε εὖ μάλα ἐπιστάμενος ἄμεινον αὐτῷ μετὰ τὴν ἐξοδὸν γενέσθαι. Put commas after αἰσχύνεται and ὧν, comparing § 78 εὐσυνειδήτους πρὸς τὴν ἐξοδὸν. For γενέσθαι read γενήσεσθαι.

Ib. τὰ πάντα ἐνὸς τοῦ παντοκράτορος θεοῦ ἴσταται. The construction ἐνὸς ἴσταται seems to be impossible, though it is passed over by all the editors. Should we read ἐξήρηται for ἴσταται, or would it suffice to insert ἐφ' before ἐνός? Compare § 84 ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ ἀδικεῖν ἴστησιν τὸν γνωστικόν.

§ 84, p. 883. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν...σπερματικῶς εἰρήσθω, ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ἐὰν ἐν τούτων ὁ πιστὸς...κατορθώσῃ, ἀλλ' οὐ τί γε ἐν πᾶσιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὴν μετ' ἐπιστήμης τῆς ἀκρας καθάπερ ὁ γνωστικός, καὶ δὴ τῆς...ἀπαθείας, καθ' ἣν ἡ τελειώσις τοῦ πιστοῦ...ιστάγγελοι ἀληθῶς γινομένη. πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα...μαρτυρία ἐπεισι παρατίθεσθαι, ἄμεινον δὲ οἶμαι κ.τ.λ. Put a full stop after εἰρήσθω and after γνωστικός, and a comma after γινομένη, the

genitive ἀπαθείας depending on μαρτύρια. Should we not omit the 2nd ἀλλά?

§ 85, p. 884. εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἐχθροὺς ἢ ἀλήθεια τοὺς παραζηλοῦντας κεκτησθαι δοκεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐ τί γε αὕτη διεχθρεύεται τι. For αὕτη read αὐτή.

Ib. διὰ τί οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἀδικεῖσθε; φησὶ, διὰ τί οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἀποστερεῖσθε; ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε [καὶ ἀποστερεῖτε], εὐχόμενοι κατὰ τούτων δηλονότι τῶν κατ' ἀγνοίαν πλημμελούντων καὶ ἀποστερεῖτε τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας... τοὺς καθ' ὧν εἵχεσθε. The 2nd ἀποστερεῖτε is a correction by Potter for the MS. ἀποστερεῖσθε. I believe the words in brackets, which are out of place where they stand, were a marginal correction of the same.

§ 86, p. 884. ἐξ ὧν συνάγεται εἰ καὶ μὴ πάντας εἶναι, ἡ μὲν γε αὐτοῖς δοκεῖν εἶναι ἀδελφοὺς. Perhaps we should read <ἀλλ' ἡμῖν γε αὐτοῖς δοκεῖν> εἶναι.

Ib. πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐνὸς ὄντας ἔργον θεοῦ... ὁ ἐπιστήμων γνωρίζει καὶ διὰ τῶν κτισμάτων τὴν ἐνέργειαν, δι' ἧς αὖθις τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ προσκινεῖ, ἢ οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ἀδικοὶ βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσιν; Can κτισμάτων be a corruption of βαπτισμάτων? See just below καὶ ταῦτα τίνες ἦτε... ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε. Put a full stop after προσκινεῖ.

§ 87, p. 885. μὴ γὰρ οὐ 'πάντα μοι ἐξεστίν; ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι,' φησὶ, παρὰ τὸ εὐαγγελίον τι ποιῆσαι... ἢ λαλῆσαι, τὰ δὲ βρώματα κ.τ.λ. Remove the mark of interrogation after ἐξεστίν and place it after λαλῆσαι.

Ib. βιούντας ὡς διὰ τὸ ἐσθίειν γενομένους, μὴ οὐχὶ δὲ ἐσθιοντας ἵνα ζῶσι μὲν κατὰ τὸ ἀκόλουθον, κατὰ δὲ τὸ προηγούμενον τῇ γνώσει προσανέχοντας. We should have expected of course προσανέχουσιν. It seems to me more probable that this should have been corrupted owing to the preceding participles, than that C. should have used such an awkward construction as the text presents.

Ib. καὶ μὴ τι οἷον σάρκας εἶναι τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος τούτους φησὶ. Put a question after φησὶ.

Ib. τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦτο πνευματικόν... οὐ τῇ πορνείᾳ, οὐδὲ τῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἀποστάσει, ἢ πρὸς τὸν ἐθνικὸν βίον κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον... οἰκειωτόν. Omit ἢ and remove the preceding comma: πρὸς connects ἀποστάσει with τὸν ἐθνικὸν βίον.

§ 88, p. 885. πορνεὺς γὰρ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὸ αὐτοῦ σῶμα ὁ ἐθνικῶς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ πολιτευόμενος. For αὐτοῦ, which has no reference, read perhaps ἅγιον, as we have immediately below another body distinguished from this, as οὐχ ἅγιον.

§ 88, p. 885. ὁ ταύτη κολλώμενος τῇ πόρῃ, τῇ παρὰ τὴν διαθήκην ἐνέργειᾳ, ἄλλο σῶμα γίνεται, οὐχ ἅγιον εἰς σάρκα μίαν καὶ βίον <ἔχει> ἐθνικὸν καὶ ἄλλην ἐλπίδα, ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ [ἐν πνεύματι πνευματικὸν σῶμα] τὸ διάφορον τῆς συνόδου γένος υἱὸς οὗτος ἅπας. Put a full stop at the beginning instead of Dindorf's comma: remove the comma from before to after οὐχ ἅγιον, and put a colon after ἐλπίδα. The insertion of ἔχει seems to me unnecessary. The construction of τὸ διάφορον γένος, as cognate accusative after κολλώμενος, would be clearer if πνευματικὸν σῶμα were put after γένος. It is tempting to restore the original ἐν πνεύματι ἐστὶ for ἐν πνεύματι, in which case the whole clause which I have bracketed must be put after γένος and separated by a colon from υἱὸς.

Ib. p. 886. μὴ τι οὖν τέλειοι γίνεσθαι ὀφείλομεν, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ βούλεται. Put a question after βούλεται.

§ 89, p. 886. After speaking of the necessity of meeting the objections of opponents C. continues εἰ ἂν ἔχοι, πρότερον διακαθάραντας τὰ ἔμποδον εὐτρεπεῖς ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν ἀποριῶν λύσεις εἰς τὸν ἐξῆς προίναι στρωματέα. Put a comma after λύσεις and read εὐτρεπῶς.

Ib. p. 887. λέγοντες μὴ δεῖν πιστεῖν διὰ τὴν διαφωνίαν τῶν αἱρέσεων, παρατείνει γὰρ καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἄλλον ἄλλα δογματίζοντων. This is an objection drawn from the differences among Christians: 'the voice of truth is drowned amid the din of conflicting assertions.' But no violence will get anything like this sense out of παρατείνει. Hoeschel suggested παραφθίνει (not παραφαίνει, as Dindorf states), which is not found elsewhere, but would suit the context very well.

Ib. οὐ δῆπον φατὲ δεῖν ὀκνεῖν ἥτοι φιλοσοφεῖν καὶ Ἰουδαῖζεν τῆς διαφωνίας ἕνεκα. For καὶ read ἢ.

§ 90. μὴ τι οὖν... ἀφεξόμεθα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἡμεῖς. Put a question after ἡμεῖς.

§ 91. p. 888. Full stop, instead of comma, after ἀποστατίον.

§ 92. ἐν μόνῃ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀρχαίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἢ τε ἀκριβεστάτῃ γνώσει καὶ ἢ τῷ ὄντι ἀρίστη αἵρεσις, τῶν τε κ.τ.λ. Read ἀληθείᾳ for ἀληθείᾳ. It is a mere truism to say that 'the most exact knowledge is in the truth.' What C. maintains is that it is in the true Church, cf. below § 100, p. 894 οἱ ἐν τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἢ ἀληθὴς and § 107 τὴν ἀληθῆ ἐκκλησίαν τὴν τῷ ὄντι ἀρχαίαν. Put a full stop after αἵρεσις and read δὲ for the following τε.

§ 93, p. 889. ὁ τὴν αἰώνιον ἐλπίζων ἀνάπαυσιν γινώσκει καὶ τὴν εἰσὸδον αὐτῆς

ἐπίπονον οὖσαν...ὅ τε ἄπαξ εὐαγγελισθεὶς καὶ τὸ σωτήριον, φησὶν, ἐν ᾗ ὥρα ἐπιγνῶ, μὴ ἐπιστρέψέσθω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω. For τε read δέ and for ἐπιγνῶ read perhaps ἐπέγνων, inserting after it <μετὰ χαρᾶς λαβών> from Matt. xiii. 20.

§ 93, p. 889. ὁ γὰρ φιλῶν πατέρα...ὑπὲρ ἐμὲ...οὐκ ἔστι μου ἄξιος, λέγει τοῦ εἶναι υἱὸς θεοῦ... καὶ συγγενῆς. Put a comma after λέγει and a full stop, instead of a comma, after συγγενῆς. There should be a full stop again at the end of the quotation from Luke ix. 62, which follows; as it has nothing to do with the comparison between the Virgin Mother and the Scriptures, with which the § ends.

§ 94, p. 890. τέτοκεν καὶ οὐ τέτοκεν φησὶν ἡ γραφή, ὡς ἂν ἐξ αὐτῆς...συνλαβοῦσα, διόπερ τοῖς γνωστικοῖς κεκυήκασιν αἱ γραφαί. αἱ δὲ αἵρέσεις οὐκ ἐκμαθοῦσαι ὡς μὴ κεκυήκίας παραπέμπονται. Put a comma before and after φησὶν, a full stop after συνλαβοῦσα and a colon after γραφαί.

Ιβ. οἱ τοιοῦτοι δὲ αἶτε ἀποπεσόντες τῆς ὀρθῆς ὁδοῦ καὶ τοῖς πλείστοις τῶν κατὰ μέρος σφάλονται. For καὶ read κἂν.

§ 95. καθάπερ οὖν εἴ τις ἐξ ἀνθρώπων θηρίον γένοιτο...οὕτως ἄνθρωπος εἶναι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πιστὸς τῷ κυρίῳ διαμένειν, ἀπολώλεκεν ὁ ἀναλακτίσας κ.τ.λ. For ἀνθρώπων read ἀνθρώπου as we have just below ἐξ ἀνθρώπου θεὸς ἀποτελεῖται. Omit the comma after διαμένειν, which is governed by ἀπολώλεκεν.

Ιβ. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ πιστὸς τῇ κυριακῇ... φωνῇ ἀξιόπιστος εἰκότως ἂν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐνεργεσίαν ἐνεργουμένη. Dindorf after Klotz has printed the nominative by mistake for the dative ἐνεργουμένη of the older editions. The true reading is, I believe, ἐνεργοῦμενος: 'he who believes the word of the Lord is worthy of credit, being one who would be naturally actuated by the Lord for the benefit of men.' Put a colon, instead of a comma, after κριτηρίῳ in the following sentence.

§ 96, p. 891. οὐθ' ὡς λέγονται γινώσκοντες οὐθ' ὡς ἔχουν πεφύκασιν χρώμενοι, αἷς καὶ δὴ κομίζουσιν ἐκλογαῖς. Put the comma before, instead of after, χρώμενοι.

Ιβ. οὐτ' ἔχουσιν ὅπως διάθωνται τὰς αὐτῶν δόξας βιαζόμενοι τὰς γραφάς, φθάσαντες δὲ ἐξενεγκέιν...δόγματα ψευδῆ...ἐλεγχόμενοι τὸ λοιπὸν ἔτι καὶ νῦν ὑπομένουσι, τὰ μὲν μὴ προσίσθαι τῶν προφητικῶν, τὰ δὲ [ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς]...μὴ οἷους τε εἶναι συνέιναι τὰ οἰκία ἐκείνοις διαβάλλοντες. Put a full stop after γραφάς, transfer ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς after τὰ μὲν, and change διαβάλλοντες to διαβάλλοντες. The οὕτως at the end of the § seems to be

merely a dittography of that at the beginning of § 97.

§ 97, p. 892. ὁρῶντες οὖν τὸν κίνδυνον αὐτοῖς οὐ περὶ ἐνὸς δόγματος, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὸ τὰς αἵρέσεις διατηρεῖν οὐ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐξευρίσκειν, τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἐν μέσῳ καὶ προχείρως ἐντυχόντες...κατεφρόνησαν, ὑπερβῆναι δὲ σπουδάσαντες τὸ κοινὸν τῆς πίστεως, ἐξέβησαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. For τὸ read τοῦ, put a comma after διατηρεῖν, for προχείρως read προχείροις. Bracket τοῖς μὲν...κατεφρόνησαν as parenthetical, ἐξευρίσκειν being governed by σπουδάσαντες.

§ 98. οὐκ ἀναγκαῖας ἀρχὰς πραγμάτων καταβαλλόμενοι δόξαις τε ἀνθρωπίναις κεκνημένοι. Read δέ for τε.

Ιβ. πάντα μᾶλλον ὑπομένουσι...ἥπερ μετατίθενται [ὑπὸ φιλοτιμίας] τῆς αἵρέσεως. Perhaps the words in brackets were lost from before ὑπομένουσι, owing to the recurrence of ὑπό, and have been wrongly inserted where they stand.

Ιβ. τριττὴ δὲ θεραπεία οὐσίσεως...μάθησίν τε τοῦ αἰτίου καὶ τὸ πῶς ἂν ἐξαίρεθῇ τοῦτο...καὶ ὁ ἐθισμὸς πρὸς τοῖς κριθείσιν ὀρθῶς ἔχειν ἀκολουθεῖν δύνασθαι. For τό read τοῦ, and insert τό before τοῖς κριθείσιν.

§ 101, p. 894. ἄλλο μὲν τι εἶναι ἡδονὴν ἣν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπονεμητέον, ἄλλο δέ τι ἔριν ἣν ἐν ταῖς αἵρέσεσι προκριτέον. Omit ἐν after ἣν in each case, and read προσκριτέον.

§ 102, p. 895 εἴη μὲν <ἂν> οὖν τοῦσδε τοὺς αἵρετικούς...σωφρονισθῆναι τε καὶ ἐπιστρέψαι ἐπὶ τὸν παντοκράτορα θεόν. εἰ δὲ καθάπερ οἱ κωφοὶ τῶν ὀφεινῶν...μὴ ἐπαίονεν ἄσματος, παιδευθεῖεν οὖν πρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ...ἀλλὰ μὴ εἰς τὴν παντελῆ φέροντες ἑαυτοὺς...ἐμβάλλοιεν κρίσιν. Dindorf's ἂν is not required: εἴη is pure optative, like παιδευθεῖεν in the next sentence.

Ιβ. ταυτὶ μὲν ἀποτρέψαι βουλόμενος τῆς εἰς τὰς αἵρέσεις ἐεμπτωσίας τοὺς φιλομαθοῦντας παρεθέμην, τοὺς δὲ τῆς ἐπιπολαζούσης...ἀμαθίας...ἀποπαῖσαι γλιχόμενος...τοῖσδε συνεχρησάμην τοῖς λόγοις. Put a colon after παρεθέμην, and a comma before ἀποτρέψαι and after φιλομαθοῦντας.

§ 103, p. 896. τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν παρηγορίαν ἀποτέμνουσαν, καίονσαν τὰς ψευδεῖς δόξας. Instead of the comma insert καὶ which has been lost before καίονσαν.

Ιβ. ἐπεχέτω τὰ ὅσα τῆς ψυχῆς. So Dindorf without note and without reason for ὑπεχέτω in the older editions.

Ιβ. ραθυμοῦσι μὲν γὰρ οἱ παρὸν τὰς οἰκίας ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν γραφῶν πορίζεσθαι ἀποδείξεις τὸ παράπαν καὶ ταῖς ἡδοναῖς αὐτῶν συναυρόμενον ἐκλεγόμενοι. Put a comma before παρὸν and after ἀποδείξεις.

§ 104. ὁρθότατα βιοῖ τὰς ἀποδείξεις ἅς ἂν ἐπιζητήσῃ ἀνευρίσκειν, ἀναπεμπόμενος

ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ἀπὸ τε νόμου καὶ προφητῶν. I am disposed to read παραπεμπόμενος, which is a favourite word with C., translating 'being helped along by the Lord to discover the proofs, whatever they may be, which he is in search of.' Compare § 109 τὴν δὲ πίστιν καὶ τὴν βάσιν δι' οὗ τοῦ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα παραπέμπουσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν, Anton. ii. 17 τί οὖν τὸ παραπέμψαι δυνάμενον; φιλοσοφία. Put a comma after βιοῖ and remove those after ἀνευρίσκων and after κυρίου.

§ 107, p. 898. After mentioning Glaucias a disciple of Peter, and Theodas a disciple of Paul, C. continues Μαρκίων γὰρ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αὐτοῖς ἡλικίαν γενόμενος ὡς πρεσβύτης νεωτέροις συνεγένετο. H. reads Μάρκος for Μαρκίων, following Gieseler in *A.L.Z.* 1823, p. 826.

P. 899. ἐνὸς γὰρ ὄντος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐνὸς τοῦ κυρίου. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἄκρως τίμιον κατὰ τὴν μόνον ἐπαινεῖται μίμημα ὃν ἀρχῆς τῆς μίας. Remove the stop after κυρίου, comparing

§ 91 δυσέργου τῆς ἀληθείας τυχαίουσιν, διὰ τοῦτο γεγόνασιν αἱ ζητήσεις.

§ 109, p. 900. ὁππῶτε οὖν τινὰ ὑποδείξαντες τοῖς φιλοθεάμοσι... ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ τὰς θυσίας νόμου περὶ τε Ἰουδαίων... περὶ τε τῶν αἰρέσεων μυστικῶς διακρινόμενων, ὡς ἀκαθάρτων ἀπὸ τῆς [περὶ καθαρῶν καὶ ἀκαθάρτων ζώων] θείας ἐκκλησίας καταπαύσωμεν τὸν λόγον. Lowth transferred the words in brackets putting them after νόμον. This necessary transposition is unnoticed by Dindorf. Put a comma before ἀπὸ and after ἐκκλησίας.

§ 110, p. 901. σποράδην, ὡς ὑπεσχίμεθα, καὶ διερριμμένους τὰ ζώπυρα τῶν τῆς ἀληθείας γνώσεως ἐγκατασπειράντων δόγματα... μετῴμεν. Read ἐγκατασπείραντες δογμάτων.

J. B. MAYOR.

P.S.—The eighth book being entirely unconnected with the preceding books, and probably belonging to Clement's later work, the Ὑποτυπώσεις, I shall here terminate my notes on the *Stromateis*.

MISCELLANEA CRITICA.

I.

1. THE action of Sophocles's *Antigone* begins early in the morning of the day following the battle of the chieftains. The Argive army has fled in the night (see vv. 100 sqq.). Antigone brings Ismene without the palace (v. 18 sq.) to tell her of the proclamation just (ἀπρίως, v. 8) made by Creon. Of this Antigone has been informed privately (v. 9 sq.) and unofficially (ὡς λέγουσι, v. 23; φασιν, v. 27; φασι, v. 31). After telling Ismene what is reported of the proclamation Antigone continues (vv. 31 sqq.):

τοιαῦτά φασιν τὸν ἀγαθὸν Κρέοντα σοὶ
κάμοι—λέγω γὰρ καμὲ—κηρύξαντ' ἔχειν
καὶ δεῦρο νεῖσθαι ταῦτα τοῖσι μὴ εἰδόσιν
σαφὴ προκηρύξοντα κτέ.

The words φασιν δεῦρο νεῖσθαι, taken in connection with Antigone's previous designation of Creon as 'the general' (τὸν στρατηγόν, v. 8; see Prof. Humphreys's excellent note), would naturally lead us to suppose that Creon had made his proclamation before the army, but was not yet returned to the palace, where he intended to make a second proclamation τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσιν. With this supposition everything seems to be in accord. It is, therefore, somewhat sur-

prising to find Professor Campbell apparently the only supporter of this view of the situation. (See his *Sophocles*, i.² p. 455: 'Creon may not have followed far [in the pursuit of the Argives] and may have been recalled by the cares of State, though he is only returning to the palace when the elders encounter him.' [The italics are mine.]) Professor Jebb says (on vv. 162-331): 'Creon, the new king, enters from the central door of the palace.' So too Professor Semitelos (on vv. 162-331): 'Ἐν ᾧ χρόνῳ ὁ χορὸς ἢ μᾶλλον ὁ κορυφαῖος ἀπήγγελλε τοὺς προηγουμένους ἀναπαίστους, ὁ Κρέων ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῆς μέσης τῶν κατὰ τὴν σκηνὴν τριῶν θυρῶν ἐχώρει ἐπὶ τὸ προσκήνιον κτέ.' But according to what seems a sound interpretation of Sophocles's own words, as quoted above, Creon would have entered from the side, as one coming from the battle-field.

2. In *Ant.* 178 the word γὰρ has given several commentators needless trouble. To make the matter clear I will briefly analyze Creon's speech from the beginning. 'The gods have righted the ship of state (vv. 162 sq.), but I have summoned you, because I know your loyalty to Laius, to Oedipus, and to Eteocles and Polynices (vv. 164-169). Since, then, they are dead, the supreme power in the state reverts to me by virtue

of consanguinity (vv. 170-174). A less adroit prince than Creon might next have said: 'Therefore I expect you to be loyal to me.' But Creon continues: 'But it is impossible to know any man's temper, till he be tried in office (vv. 175-177).' Then follow the words *ἐμοὶ γὰρ κτέ.*, which, if we are not tied down to the belief that *γὰρ* always = 'for,' we shall naturally render: 'In my eyes then,' &c. So we shall regard *ἐγὼ γὰρ* in v. 184 as resuming *ἐμοὶ γὰρ*, and shall render: 'I then'; and, finally, we shall regard *ἐγὼ* in v. 191 as a resumption of the other two *ἐγῶ*'s. Whether or not we should write in vv. 178 and 184 *γ' ἄρ'* I will not undertake to decide. But I would call attention to Professor Jebb's very laboured explanation of the two *γὰρ*'s (each = 'for'!) in his commentary and (as an *exemplum in terrorem*) to M. Tournier's note in his *Appendice Critique*: 'Γάρ, loin de marquer l'enchaînement des idées, ne sert qu'à en troubler l'ordre. Il faut écrire *ἐμοὶ μὲν*.' It is a relief to find Mr. Blaydes writing (on v. 178): '*ἐμοὶ γὰρ*— "Now to me, to me then," &c. In explanation of the preceding sentiment.'

It may be added that the fact that vv. 178-190 are resumed for transition's sake in v. 191 in the form *τοιούτῳδ' ἐγὼ νόμοις τήνδ' αἰξω πόλιν* excludes M. Tournier's otherwise plausible *θρόνοις* (for *νόμοις*) in v. 177. We see, furthermore, that *νόμοι* in both places means 'principles of conduct.' This brings us to the pertinent question, What does *ἀρχαῖς* (v. 178) mean?

We have gathered from v. 191 that vv. 178-190 are an explanation of *νόμοις* in v. 177. We find, furthermore, that v. 192 is contrasted (*καὶ νῦν*) with v. 191. If we accept the traditional reading in v. 191 (*τήνδ' αἰξω πόλιν*) which is well supported by Plato (*Laws* 731 A, cited also by Professor Jebb), we must see here, not a contrast of *time* (between a future *ἄρξω* or *ἄξω* and *νῦν*), but a contrast of another sort. There must then, be a contrast between *νόμοις* and something else. That 'something else' is the *κήρυγμα* implied in *κηρύξας ἔχω*, and the contrast is, in more general terms, between 'principle' and 'conduct,' or 'action.' We may, then, venture to interpret *ἀρχαῖς* as 'actions of a ruler.' Thus we have a chiasmic arrangement: (a) *ἀρχαῖς* (v. 177); (b) *νόμοις* (v. 177); (b) *ἐμοὶ γὰρ—ποιούμεθα* (vv. 178-190); (a) *καὶ νῦν—πέρι* (vv. 192-3),—the last fully explained in the verses that follow. Nor is this at all too subtle for Sophocles.

3. In *Ant.* 580 sq. we read:

φεύγουσι γὰρ τοὶ χοῖ θρασεῖς, ὅταν πέλας
ἦδῃ τὸν Ἀἰδῶν εἰσπαύσῃ τοῦ βίου.

Professor Humphreys's note on v. 581 is interesting: '*βίου* depends on *πέλας* (*ὄντα*): without limiting gen., Eur. *Alc.* 24 ἦδῃ δὲ τόνδε θάνατον εἰσπαύει πέλας (visible presence).' The parallelism between the expression in the *Antigone* and that in the *Alcestis* is indeed striking, though Professor Humphreys calls no further attention to it. The 'visible presence' of Thanatos seems to be thought of by Sophocles almost as distinctly as by Euripides, Again in *Ant.* 806 sqq. we read:

δρᾶτ' ἔμ', ὦ γᾶς πατρίας πολῖται τὰν νεάταν
ὁδὸν
στείχουσιν, νεάτον δὲ φέγγος λείσουσιν
ἡλίου,
κούποτ' αἰθῆς· ἀλλὰ μ' ὁ παγκοίτας Ἀιδας
ξῶσαν ἄγει
τὰν Ἀχέροντος
ἁκτάν, κτέ.

With these words of the doomed Antigone we may compare those of the dying Alcestis (*Alc.* 259-263), particularly *ἄγει μ' ἄγει μέ τις* and *περὶ τὸς Ἀιδας* with *ἀλλὰ μ' ὁ—ἄγει*, and *οἶαν ὁδὸν—προβαίνω* with *τὰν—στείχουσιν*. But we find a still more noticeable parallel to the *Alcestis* in this passage of the *Antigone*. In *Alc.* 205-208 the traditional text is:

ὁμῶς δέ, καίπερ σμικρὸν ἐμπνέουσ' ἔτι,
βλέψαι πρὸς αὐγὰς βούλεται τὰς ἡλίου,
ὡς οὐποτ' αἰθῆς, ἀλλὰ νῦν πανύστατον,
ἁκτῖνα κύκλον δ' ἡλίου προσόψεται.

Valekenauer and Hermann have condemned vv. 207-8, and I have followed them in my text. But a comparison of the words in the *Antigone* *νεάτον—κούποτ' αἰθῆς* has suggested a somewhat different treatment. The expression in the *Antigone* is noticeable for its ellipsis: after *κούποτ' αἰθῆς* we must mentally supply *ὁφόμεναι* or the like. Now in the *Alcestis* we shall have the same sort of expression (indeed, almost the same expression), if we simply drop v. 208 and put a full stop at the end of v. 207. We can then the more readily understand the introduction of *Hec.* 212 into the text of the *Alcestis*.

Of course, all this, if sound, is but a further support of the theory of a close relation between the *Alcestis* and the *Antigone*.

4. In *Ant.* 795 sq.,
 νικᾶι δ' ἐναργῆς βλεφάρων ἴμερος εὐλέκτρον
 νύμφας,

Professor Campbell's sound adherence to the Greek order of words has led him to join νικᾶι and ἐναργῆς ('i.e. ἐναργῆς ἐστι νικῶσα'). But this is not the end of the matter. In *Thuc.* 7, 55.1 we find Γεγεννημένης δὲ τῆς νίκης τοῖς Συρακοσίοις λαμπρῶς ἤδη κτέ. Here the parallel passages

cited make it extremely probable that we should accept Classen's λαμπρῶς (Mr. Holden, who keeps λαμπρῶς, cites λαμπρῶς ἐνίκα from *Plut. Sull.* 29, 5). At all events, νικᾶν λαμπρῶς seems to have been a current expression (cf. *Schol. Ar. Ran.* 73 Dind.), and we need not hesitate to see in the Sophoclean phrase a poetical νικᾶι δὲ λαμπρῶς. Shall we not then read νικᾶι δ' ἐναργῶς?

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

THE EMPEROR CLAUDIUS AND THE CHIEFS OF THE AEDUI.

In connection with his account of Claudius' censorship, Tacitus¹ tells us that when the revision of the senate was in progress, the chiefs of Gallia Comata, that is to say, of the provinces known as the 'Three Gauls' who had been for a long time Roman citizens, asked for the right of obtaining honours in the city (*jus adipiscendorum in urbe honorum*); or, as Tacitus expresses it in a later passage, for the right of senators (*senatorum jus*). The question at once arises how it was that these chiefs being already Roman citizens were disqualified from standing for office in Rome; and secondly, what was the nature of the relief which Claudius gave them.

The ordinary explanation is that given by Mr. Furneaux² in his note on the passage. It is supposed that when the Roman franchise was conferred by Julius or Augustus upon the fathers or grandfathers of these Gallic chieftains, it was granted in a restricted and imperfect form and that the *jus honorum* was withheld. In support of this supposition, the analogy is quoted of the imperfect franchise (*civitas sine suffragio*) anciently granted by Rome to some of the Italian communities. It is further assumed that what Claudius did was to make this imperfect franchise complete. There are however serious objections to this view of the matter. The granting of the *civitas sine suffragio* has not been infrequent at one period in the history of Rome, but there is no instance of its bestowal later than 184 B.C., and the great majority of the instances known to us belong to a much earlier period. It is scarcely likely that so

antiquated a precedent should have suggested a policy to Julius or Augustus. There is again no evidence that the *jus honorum* was treated as a distinct privilege separable from the other rights included in the franchise. It is obviously unlikely that the separation should have been made in this one case alone and that a peculiar disability should have been imposed upon the chiefs of Gaul, especially in view of the pains taken by both Julius and Augustus to conciliate these powerful chieftains, and of the fact that Julius in particular went to the length of admitting some of them to the senate.

The truth is that inability to stand for public office in Rome was not a disqualification peculiar to the Gaulish chiefs or even to provincials generally, but one which extended equally to natives of Italy whose ancestors had for generations been Roman citizens. It seems to be certain that in the time of Claudius even a Roman knight was not accepted as a candidate for a magistracy unless he were possessed of the broad stripe which marked senatorial rank. It must also be remembered that this case of the Gaulish chieftains arose directly in connection with the revision of the senatorial roll, and that Tacitus, in the later of the two passages referred to above, implies that it was the dignity of senator or, more accurately, the rights of senators for which the chiefs asked and which they obtained. If we turn to the fragments that remain of Claudius' speech, it becomes clear that what he is dealing with is not so much a constitutional disability or any inherent defect in the status of the Gauls as Roman citizens, but a deep-seated Roman prejudice against the admission of these barbarians to the senate. The inference seems to be that

¹ *Ann.* 11, 23.

² Furneaux, *Ann. Tac.* vol. 2, p. 186. Schiller, *Gesch. d. Kaiserzeit.* 1. 329.

the real obstacle in the path of these noble Gauls was the fact that, though Roman citizens and very probably in some cases Roman knights, they had not the broad senatorial stripe and that therefore the doors of the senate-house were closed to them. There were two recognized methods by which such an obstacle could be removed. In the first place, the emperor might have granted to them the broad stripe alone. The effect of such a concession would have been that the Gaulish nobles (*insignes viri*) whom Claudius saw before him as he spoke would have been at once enabled to offer themselves for the quaestorship and would thus have found the way open both to a seat in the senate and to the higher magistracies. Their course would have been that concisely described by Pliny (*ep.* 2, 9), when speaking of what he had done for a countryman of his own. 'I obtained for him,' he says, 'from Caesar the broad stripe and I afterwards obtained for him the quaestorship.' Many other instances might be quoted from the inscriptions. This however does not seem to have been the method employed by Claudius on this occasion. He was acting as censor, and he alludes in his speech 'to this part of my censorship,' but the grant of the broad stripe was not a censorial act. It seems to have been connected with the emperor's right of nomination, or in other words with his right of testing and approving the qualifications of candidates, in doing which he was free to supply the qualifications which were lacking, whether it were the broad stripe or the required amount of property. Moreover, the general tenor of Claudius' speech seems to imply that it is not the grant of the broad stripe, but the alternative method, that of direct admission into the senate (*adlectio*), which he has in view.

In other words, the conclusion to which Claudius' speech points, is that, in revising the senate as censor, he had proposed directly to admit these Gaulish chieftains to the senate, and probably to admit them into the ranks of the *Quaestorii*, the lowest category of senators, a precedent followed in many cases by Vespasian. The Gauls who were thus 'adlecti inter quaestorios,' would become senators and eligible for the higher magistracies. Moreover their sons would rank as *laticlavii*, along with other senators' sons and would be qualified in their turn to stand for the quaestorship, and to obtain through the quaestorship a seat in the senate. This direct admission to the senate was an act well within the rights of

Claudius as censor. Why then did he feel it necessary to consult the senate on the point? In all probability, because the admission of Gaulish chiefs from the Three Gauls was a new departure for which it was at least politic to obtain the sanction of the senate. Never before, it would seem, had provincials found their way into the senate except from such old established and thoroughly Romanized provinces as Narbonese Gaul and Spain. Indeed Claudius himself, when justifying this part of his censorship, confesses that he is stepping with some timidity outside the limits hitherto observed. He had in fact to encounter a strong prejudice. Nothing that Julius did excited more odium at Rome than his admission to the senate of 'semibarbari Galli,' and the prejudice reappears in Seneca's Satire on Claudius. Nor was the prejudice altogether unreasonable. The Gaulish chiefs of Gallia Comata were not only disliked on sentimental grounds as belonging to the race which had once sacked Rome, but their actual position was somewhat different from that of the wealthy citizens of a Greek or Asiatic community. They were wealthy, they were ambitious, but the distinctive feature of their position was that, though the communities to which they belonged were outwardly organized on the Roman model, these men were still great chiefs enjoying great prestige among their countrymen and with large followings of obedient vassals and clansmen. Very much of the old tribal feeling still survived among the clans of the Three Gauls, and their leading men retained much of the peculiar influence and authority associated with the tribal chieftainship. This tribal feeling, supported as it was by a strong national sentiment, was throughout the first century A.D. a possible element of danger to Roman authority. In the reign of Tiberius, at the time of the rebellion of Sacrovir, Julius Florus appeared in the field with a vast train of clients and dependents much in the style of a Highland chief of the eighteenth century. More recently, according to Tacitus, Valerius Asiaticus, though a native of Narbonese Gaul and of the colony of Vienne, had been suspected of treasonable designs which were rendered more dangerous from his extensive connections among his countrymen (*gentiles*). A similar feeling of clanship is mentioned by Dio Cassius as a source of strength to the Aquitanian chief Gaius Julius Vindex, when he rose against Nero.

The speech in which Claudius combated

this prejudice and advocated the continuance of the liberal policy which had made Rome great, was as a matter of course convincing. A decree of the senate was passed, no fragments of which have survived, but which probably merely expressed approval of Claudius' intended action. The result was the admission to the senate of the chiefs of one single tribe, the Aedui. There is no evidence that the chiefs of any other tribes were admitted at this time, or that any general concession, such as Mr. Furneaux speaks of, was now made to the Gauls. The selection of the Aeduan chiefs as the first recipients of this special favour was quite natural. It was due, as Tacitus tells us, to the old and intimate connection between the Aedui and Rome, a connection which would render the new departure more acceptable in their case than in that of any other tribe; but the precedent thus set by Claudius was

an important one, and the example of Claudius was followed on a more liberal scale by Vespasian, and by the emperors of the second century. If however the view which I have stated above is correct, the credit of initiating the policy of freely admitting provincials of the senate, and of thus investing the senate with a genuinely imperial character, must be given to Claudius. I will close with one more suggestion. It is at least conceivable that this admission of Gaulish chiefs to the senate may not have been unconnected with the measures which Claudius is said to have taken against Druidism. Claudius may have hoped by this concession to render those measures more acceptable, and to strengthen Roman sympathies among the leading men of central and northern Gaul.

H. F. PELHAM.

THREE GEOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON PROPERTIUS.

iii. 7, 21, 22.

*Sunt Agamemnonias testantia litora curas
Quae (Quae V) notat Argynni poena
minantis aquae.*

In my dissertation of 1872 I suggested that 22 should be written either

Qua notat Argynni poena Mimantis aquas

or—

Quae notat Argynni poena, Mimantis aquae.

But I had then found to connect Argynnus or Agamemnon with the neighbourhood of Mount Mimas, besides the promontory Argennon, only the statement of Paus. vii. 5, 6, that Agamemnon was specially honoured in the neighbourhood of Clazomenae. To this may now be added the legend mentioned by Strabo xiv. C 639, where he speaks of Ephesus and the places adjacent, *εἴτα Νεάπολις...εἴτα Πύγela πολίχνην*; *ἱερὸν ἔχον Ἀρτέμιδος Μονυχίας, ἱδρυμα Ἀγαμέμνονος, οἰκούμενον ὑπὸ μέρους τῶν ἐκείνου λαῶν πυγαλίας γὰρ τινὰς καὶ γενέσθαι καὶ κληθῆναι, κάμνοντας δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους καταμείναι, καὶ τυχεῖν οἰκίου τοῦδε τοῦ ὀνόματος τὸν τόπον.* Cf. *Etym. M.* s.v. Πύγela. From Clazomenae Teos and M. Mimas the distance along the coast to Ephesus is

inconsiderable, and there is nothing wonderful in Agamemnon's rowers being found here and giving their name, traditionally, to a place called Pygela. Livy xxxvii. 11 calls it *Pygela portus*.

Amongst others who were shipwrecked in the neighbourhood of M. Mimas, Phaedrus *Fab.* iv. 23, 17 mentions the poet Simonides.

ii. 13, 47, 48.

*Cui si longaeuæ minuisset fata senectæ
†Gallicus Iliacis miles in aggeribus.*

The allusion, I believe, is to the Gallograeci whose reputation for daring and desperate courage is mentioned by Livy xxxvii. 8 *Etiam in Gallograeciam miserat: bellicosiores ea tempestate erant, Gallicos adhuc, nondum exoleta stirpe gentis, seruantes animos.* ib. 18 *Plurimum terroris in Gallorum mercede conductis quattuor milibus erat.* 'Had Nestor encountered at Troy some fierce Galatian soldier, instinct with the fury of his native country Gaul, and thus died prematurely.' The anachronism is (no doubt) patent; but (1) it is not alien from Propertius' practice, (2) *Gallicus* need mean nothing more than a soldier of the type so well known as Gallo-Greek, i.e. desperate and unsparing.

iv. 3, 37, 38.

*Cogor et e tabula pictos ediscere mundos
Qualis et educti sit positura Dahi.*

Dahi, which I have before defended,
J. of Philol. xxii. 72, cf. Postgate *C.P.L.*
ad. loc., is well illustrated by Livy xxxv.

48 *Nominibus quoque gentium uix fando
auditis terrebat, Dahas Medos Elymaeosque
et Cadusios appellans.* The name Daan or
Dahan was a more or less indeterminate one,
and would have to be looked out on the map.

R. ELLIS.

GERMAN OPINION ON GREEK JUSSIVES.

(Conclusion.)

It is no easy task to bring proof positive to show that the aorist stem function is that of 'concluded action.' So far our arguments have been indirect, and, for the most part, merely subversive of other systems. We have raised objections both to the 'momentary' theory as well as to that of 'eintretende Handlung' (I use the original term as it denotes more than we express by ingressive action). Considerations however are not wanting which go to establish a high degree of probability for the hypothesis of 'concluded action.'

1. We have first the analogy of the corresponding idiom in the Slavonic tongues. It should here be noted that at least in modern Polish the form corresponding to the Greek aorist is sometimes formed not by change in the stem, but by prefixing a preposition meaning end. Professor Hatzidakis of the πανεπιστήμιον of Athens has already called attention to the value of the Slavonic languages towards the solution of the problem we are now discussing. In a review of Flegel's *Geschichte der Arten der Handlung in Europa*¹ he tells us that western scholars were for a long time led astray in their classification of Greek tenses through the influence of Roman grammarians, whereas the Slavonic nations best preserved the traditions of the Byzantine grammarians, because, to quote his own words,² βοηθούμενοι ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως τῆς γλώσσης αὐτῶν, διαστελλούσης ἄριστα τὰς συγγενείας ταύτας (the affinities of the various tenses when classified not κατὰ τὴν χρονολογικὴν βαθμίδα but κατὰ τὴν ποιότητα τῆς ἐνεργείας) οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἀπέβαλον ὅτι παρὰ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν παρέλαβον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέπτυξαν αὐτὸ καὶ ἀλώβητον κατὰ

πάντας σχεδὸν τοὺς αἰῶνας διετήρησαν μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων, ὅτε καὶ ἄλλοθεν καὶ ἐκ τῶν Σλαβικῶν γλωσσῶν ἐδιδάχθησαν ταῦτα οἱ ἐπιστήμονες.

2. If attention is paid to the force of the present as contradistinguished from the aorist, in certain clauses otherwise syntactically identical, we shall find strong evidence in favour of the theory now advocated. Take temporal and relative clauses and observe the difference in meaning according as in the same sentence an aorist or present occurs. Thus ἐπειδὴν λέγω cum dicam, when(ever) I speak, *am speaking* (shall speak, *shall be speaking*), ἐπειδὴν εἶπω cum dixero (dixerim), when(ever) I shall have spoken; ὅταν ὀρίζωμεθα when(ever) we are defining, ὅταν ὀρισώμεθα when(ever) we (shall) have defined; ἃ ἂν δόξῃ quae videantur (videbuntur), ἃ ἂν δόξῃ quae visa fuerint; the Homeric ἐπὶν πολίεθρον ἔλωμεν cum urbem ceperimus. In clauses such as the foregoing the aorist has generally to be rendered by a Latin perfect stem. It is true that, in rendering into English, we often dispense ourselves from using the corresponding somewhat cumbersome equivalent. It also may happen that in our language this difference sometimes scarcely makes itself felt. Thus εἰν ἐθέλωμεν, 'if we have no objection,' does not materially differ from εἰν ἐθελήσωμεν 'if we shall have entertained no objection.' Nevertheless the distinction is present to the Greek mind and would always have to be taken into account by a Latin, if not by an English, translator. Moreover it sometimes occasions idioms of importance to the grammarian. For instance εἰς ἂν (ἕως ἂν, μέχρι ἂν) with present subjunctive commonly means 'whilst,' whereas εἰς ἂν with aorist invariably means 'until.' The examples where εἰς ἂν with present subj. means 'until' are comparatively few, yet they serve to illustrate and confirm

¹ I have not succeeded in procuring a copy of this valuable work and so have been unable to make use of it for the foregoing sketch.

² vide AΘΗΝΑ 1890, τόμος δεύτερος, τεῦχος τρίτον καὶ τέταρτον, page 377 sq.

the doctrine here insisted on, viz. that the aorist marks the 'conclusion,' the present the 'evolution' or development of an action. 'Until' marks a *limit* in time, i.e. a point *up to which* not *during which* some act extends. Hence when this limit (τὸ πέρας) coincides with another action which is not considered as 'concluded' but is regarded as 'having begun and still developing itself,' i.e. as running on towards the end which is not yet reached, the aorist stem ceases to be appropriate and the present becomes necessary, the idea being: 'until something is *doing*,' not 'until it is done.' Thus ὕβρις ἔως ἂν τὴν δίκην ἄρχων καλῇ till he is *calling*. See a valuable note of Shilleto's on Thucyd. i. 90, 3, where he tells us that 'ἔως ἂν, ἔστ' ἂν, μέχρι ἂν with an aorist subjunctive could not mean *while*, yet with a present may mean *until*, i.e. *not the concluded but the incipient act*.' I feel quite certain this eminent scholar meant nothing else by 'incipient' than what has here been termed 'action evolving itself, with the end left out of sight.' I have met somewhere in a German grammar a similar use of the word 'eintretend' used, namely, as descriptive of present stems. Yet it is not quite *the beginning* but rather the *progress and evolution* of an action that is primarily expressed by present stems, although of course such beginning is presupposed and in so far implicitly conveyed.¹

The question then arises, How comes it to pass that, in clauses similar to those cited above, the aorist fulfils a function for which in Latin the aid of a perfect stem has to be invoked, and where in English recourse must generally be had to the form 'shall have' with past participle? The answer is not far to seek, if it be held that the idea of 'concluded action' inheres in the aorist stem and that present stems depict the action as 'not concluded, still in process of evolution.'

A similar inference may be drawn from the corresponding use of participles. These, be they grammatically present, aorist or perfect, do not *per se* express time, yet, when rendered into English or Latin, involve the use of forms which mark distinct differentiation of time. The sentence τοιαῦτα λέγων

ἐπορεύετο, 'such things was he saying as he went along,' differs widely from τοιαῦτ' εἰπὼν ἐπορεύετο 'when he had said these things he proceeded on his way.' So too μαχόμενος ἀπέθανεν he died fighting, μαχέσμενος ἀπέθανεν he died *after having fought*. The first of these pairs of sentences marks simultaneity of the actions described, the second priority of the action expressed by the aorist participle, and in rendering it into English we can scarcely avoid the use of past tenses (indicative), or at least of past participles. Equivalently the aorist participle comes to express time past relatively to that of the present participle, so much so that for practical purposes the aorist participle may be said loosely to express past time.

How are these facts to be accounted for? An explanation is not readily forthcoming if we look on 'momentary' or 'ingressive' (eintretend) action as the function of the aorist. If on the other hand 'evolution' and 'conclusion' be the two aspects of an action conveyed respectively by present and aorist stems, these phenomena become at once intelligible. No sooner has the mind conceived of any act as 'concluded' and then calls up and places, so to speak, side by side some other action, than the idea of priority necessarily arises and hence of time, as does that of simultaneity spring up when the first act is pictured not as 'concluded' but as 'still in progress.' And so it comes about that the aorist participle, which of itself does not denote order in time, but only quality of the action, nevertheless, in the vast majority of instances, does *de facto* express at least relative past time, because forsooth it represents the action at its end.

An argument of like import might be based on what the Germans term 'plusquamperfectische Aorist': ἐπαυθὲν πάντα ἐπράχθη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ 'when everything *had been* accomplished he went away.' Every one is familiar with this idiom of the Greek aorist being used where Latin and English employs a pluperfect. Here too the hypothesis of 'concluded action' solves a problem otherwise difficult of solution.

3. The following purely philological proof drawn from the two forms in use of the Latin perfect—those in -si and those in -i, -vi, -ui—was supplied me by Mr. de Borkowski. I will give it in his own words, merely stating that the coalescence of two forms genetically different—one obviously aoristic ending in *si* (parsi), the other a reduplicated perfect (peperci) with the termination -i, -vi, -ui—to perform indiffer-

¹ In commenting on πρὶν ἂν followed by present subjunctive (e.g. οἰώμεθα) Shilleto writes: 'in all these I understand not *opus perfectum* but *opus inchoatum*.' There, as in a nutshell, and in the words of one of our most remarkable modern scholars, is the thesis we are endeavouring to uphold. I cannot take leave of this subject without thanking my former pupil Mr. Goodier, B.A., now Professor of Humanities at Stonyhurst College, for having called my attention to this excellent note.

ently the syntactical function of action completed, whether in past or present time, points to the original meaning of the *-si* formations as being that of 'concluded action.' Mr. Borkowski argues as follows:

'Legem nostram considerantibus facile apparebit quomodo perfecta Latina cum *-si* formata sine ullo augmento ad hoc devenierint, ut fixam et stabilitam rei praeteritae notionem prae se ferrent. Cum enim constet in Latina lingua duplici via effingi perfectum, et accedente *-i* (cum reduplicatione) et accedente *-si* cuius formae ipsum *s* ad veterem aoristicum modum pertinet (reliquae formae, sive *-vi* additur ad radicem sive *-ui*, ex his derivantur), veri simile est, istas formas, quae *-si* accedente effinguntur, aliquid aliud antea significasse, atque una cum altera illa forma in unum coaluisse perfectum, quod tunc et aoristi et perfecti "functiones" continuierit.

'Itaque quaeritur quomodo aoristus ille vetus v.g. "parsi" ad hoc pervenerit ut praeter "perfecti praesentis" significationem, quam accepisse putandus est, postquam perfecti "puri" et aoristi formae in unam coniunctae sunt, determinatus sit ad praeteritum tempus designandum. Quodsi effecerimus aoristum nostrum significasse "eine abgeschlossene Handlung," facile intellegemus cogitationum affinitate evenisse, ut idem ad rem praeteritam exprimendam descenderet. Quamquam autem etiam vetus Indica lingua aliquo perf. histor. utitur, ut Latina, hoc tamen non videtur sufficere ad demonstrandum istam functionem veteris perfecti solam etiam apud Latinos effecisse, ut aoristus *-si* accedente formatus, eo tempore quo mistus est cum perfecto, firmam "praeteriti" significationem assumeret.'

4. Hitherto attention has been bestowed chiefly on ancient Greek. It may be useful to cite authorities in order to establish how far these same principles prevailed in the *κοινή*, and still hold in modern Greek. Frederick Blass in the *Prolegomena* to his critical edition of the Acts¹ of the Apostles informs us (§ 8, p. 16) that in the language of the New Testament the tenses retain their ordinary value, save that there is but one future even for the passive; that confusion between the aorist and perfect is seldom to be found, and never in Luke; that all N. T. writers recognize the distinc-

¹ *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter*, editio philologica apparatus critico, commentario perpetuo, indice verborum illustrata, auctore Friderico Blass. Dr. Phil. etc., etc. Göttingen. 1895.

tion between the aorist and the imperfect, which, he goes on to say, was so thoroughly ingrained in the language of the Greeks as to remain to this day. The following extracts from the commentary will enable the reader to form an opinion how far Blass's views tally with the theory we have been propounding.

Comment: 5₃ ad ψεύσασθαι σε 'aor. rem perfectam esse denotat'; 9₂ ad ἡγήσατο 'inest in aoristo quod etiam accepit'; 9₄₃ μέναι aor. quia terminus ad quem mansit subintelligitur ab auctore'; 14₃ διέτριψαν 'subintelligitur terminus (v. 5), inde aor.'; 20₂₄ ad διαμαρτύρασθαι 'aoristus ad perficiendum (τελειώσαι) ministerium spectat.' The following will make clear his position as regards the force of present stems: 21₂₄ ἄγεσθαι 'quia res nondum perficitur.' 21₃₀ εἰλκον 'finis rei (τὸ ἐλκύσαι) ex sequ...intellegendus; interim depingit rem imperfecto.' 3₃ ῥώπα... 'imperf. ut att. quia actio rogandi per se imperfecta est, donec praebeatur rogatum alter.' 21₁₄ 'Impf. ἐπλόμεν cursum, aor. κατήλθομεν finem denotat.' 5₂₆ ἦγεν 'impf. quia modus quo res gesta est describitur; perfecta res indicatur v. 27 ἀγαγόντες.' 8₂₆ 'Praesens πορεύου aliis quoque locis adhibetur=perge ire, nisi terminus propinquus adiunctus sit ut 9₁₁.' 9₁₅ πορεύου 'praesenti nunc utitur, quia actio ipsa spectatur, finis autem ne indicatur quidem.' 12₇ ἀκολουθεῖ praesens propter finem non indicatum.' 19₃₀ οὐκ εἶπον 'impf. est usque ad 33, ubi aoristo indicatur quid factum sit.'

Evidently for Blass the functions of the present and aorist are 'not concluded' and 'concluded action' as explained in these pages.

5. Professor G. Hatzidakis² of Athens, on being consulted by Mr. de Borkowski regarding his teaching on the points just discussed, replied in a letter of some length from which I am permitted to publish the following extract: καὶ μαθήσῃ ὅτι εὖ εἶπας τὴν νεωτέραν Ἑλληνίδα τῷ μὲν ἐνεστώτι καὶ παρατατικῷ φαίνειν τὴν πρᾶξιν ἀτελῆ καὶ ἐξελισσομένην, τῷ δ' ἀορίστῳ καὶ μέλλοντι³ παυσαμένην καὶ πέρασ

² Γεώργιος Ν. Χατζιδάκις καθηγητὴς τῆς Γλωσσολογίας ἐν τῷ Ἑθνικῷ Πανεπιστημίῳ ἐν Αθήναις.

³ Professor Hatzidakis, in his classification of tenses, invariably couples future and aorist. In that, I believe, he is following in the wake of the Alexandrine Grammarians and the reason, no doubt, is the identity of stem in these formations, cf. βαλῶ, ἔβαλον: λίσσω, ἔλυσσα. I am puzzled to know whether the quality of action attributed to these future forms by the Athenian Professor is identical with that of the aorist. Does ἐρῶ, for instance, only mean 'I shall say,' or may it not be equivalent to 'I shall be saying'? Modern Greek has two distinct forms like our own: θά γράψω and εἶ γράψω.

σχοῦσαν καθ' ἅπερ καὶ αἱ Σλανικαὶ γλώσσαι ἀριστα ταῦτα διαστέλλοντιν. This valuable testimony touching modern Greek usage needs no comment.

To mitigate however the apparent dogmatism necessarily attendant on the exponent and upholder of a particular theory—even when that theory is only put forward as highly probable—I cannot do better than conclude this too lengthy dissertation by quoting a passage from the *Allindische Syntax* of Delbrück where that scholar expresses his sense of hopelessness of discovering a satisfactory formula descriptive of the aorist stem function:¹

'Aorist. If one seeks a comprehensive formula, there can be no other forthcoming, even for Sanscrit, than that which scholars have endeavoured to extract from Greek. A fully satisfactory and short term seems to me not yet to have been found. So much is clear, that the aor. indicative stands in

¹ R. Delbrück, *Syntaktische Forschungen*, V. *Allindische Syntax* (Halle 1888), page 280 § 164.

opposition to the imperfect in so far as it never paints but only communicates the fact that an event has taken place. The quality of the action of the aor. has been described as momentary or instantaneous.² Better may it be said that in aoristic utterance the point of view of duration is not taken into account. Emphasis is only given to the fact that an action has in general taken place (...in die Erscheinung getreten sei). Under these circumstances it cannot be matter of surprise if by the aorist events are communicated which have *de facto* had very different extension in time.'

J. DONOVAN.

Stonyhurst College, Sept. 1, 1895.

² Some friends tell me they have always understood the word 'momentary' to mean 'completed and over,' and to denote a something 'past and done with' rather than an action of short duration. Their interpretation seems to me to do more credit to their Greek instinct than to their use of words. Some such explanation must naturally force itself on the teacher who attempts to expound the aorist *κατ' ἐσχῆν* of absolute past events.

THE CORRECTIONS IN THE FLORENCE MS. OF NONIUS.

- | | | | |
|---------|--------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 124, 10 | icerit C. | 127, 9 | Noli C. |
| 12 | animam C. | 10 | quisq. A. |
| | coniunctam C. | 17 | epinausimacho D. |
| | quae A. | 19 | habuisssem A. |
| 14 | demetrio na D. | | ingenio amatores A. |
| 17 | inequius D. | 128, 8 | indolentiam D. |
| 18 | quondam C. | 10 | ut C. |
| 32 | liber....quasi A. | 19 | inpetu C. |
| 34 | aut C. | 25 | ducit C. |
| 35 | Naeuius C. | 26 | Inpendio C. |
| 41 | Meleagro C. | 129, 4 | Incrustatum ornatum } A marg. |
| 125, 1 | Quis erit A. | | crustis coopertum } |
| | incilans C. | 13 | dolebam C. } |
| 2 | differret D. | | delebam D. } |
| 8 | uicissim C. | 21 | uisendi C. |
| 9 | nubunt C. | 27 | amictiam atque C. |
| 15 | myoparone C. | | promptam A. |
| 16 | Tegulas C. | 33 | apirian C. |
| 19 | patientiae C. | 130, 2 | tumulto C. |
| 20 | possit C. | 5 | Cum C. |
| 24 | Virgilius C. | 6 | intonso C. |
| 27 | Virgilius C. | 9 | q[uaere] A marg. |
| 28 | illuuiæ D. | 10 | Tudesertibus D. |
| 126, 2 | inuallnitiae A. | | senatis A.D. |
| 9 | ieientare ientare A marg. | | consulto C. |
| 28 | Infel. felicem faciant A marg. | | iussu C. |
| 31 | iniquat iniquus fit A marg. | 13 | inhisim simul A marg. |
| 33 | indignant D. | 131, 4 | inproborata A. |
| 127, 5 | cesso A. | 8 | Hecatonbe D. |

- 131, 11 *Idem idem* D.
 19 *φιλοσοφίας* C.
 26 *luculentu-lus* C. Conj.
 32 *fiet et* D.
 132, 4 *habundat* D.
 9 *Letitudine* C.
 11 *letitudinem* C.
 13 *letitudine* C.
 30 *spetiae* C.D.
 31 *Pelopidis* C.
 133, 16 *hominibus* D.E.
 134, 2 *Tusculanarum* A.
 5 *Tusculanorum* A.
 14 *ludricrae* D.
 15 *licitantur* A.
 35 *memorare* A.
 38 *celebrassit* A.
 135, 18 *M litteram* C.
 20 *ἐγκωμίων*; Dist.
 23 *m. tullius cicero* D.
 q[uaere] A marg.
 27 *enim* C?
 30 *se* C.
 136, 6 *uirginemne an* A.
uiduam uxorem A.
 14 *Astyanacte* C.
 17 *humili* A.
 29 *maclentum* E.C.
 31 *homo est nasutus* A.
 137, 2 *errore* A.
 3 *ἀρχαίπεστων* Transposuit.
 4 *attius* C.
 6 *oreste* A marg.
 13 *meritis* C.
 20 *statuunt* A.
 27 *Mestas* A.
 28 *Concitata mobilata* A.
 31 *haec est meri* D.
 138, 2 *inflammari* A.
Atridae C.
 3 *madore infusione* A marg.
 6 *cluacis* E.C.
 7 *Mercatis* A.
 17 *id quod spero* A.
 25 *mendicari* C.
 139, 14 *uiuam* C.
 18 *Paraterus* Transp. ad finem prioris
 versus.
 140, 2 *hortum* D.
 11 *certe aliis* D.
 16 *proferre* C.
et mansum A.
 20 *adulescentem* A.
 24 *Ursum se* A.
 33 *Id bellum* C.
 36 *uerba* C.
 141, 3 *M-ediox* Conj.
medie C.
 141, 5 *adiz mortalem* C marg. (duobus
 punct. supr. z).
 7 *Varro* A.
 25 *confossa* C.
 142, 4 *Galli* A.
 18 *ponitificis* E.A.
sacrorum D.C.
 25 *filogenea* A.
 143, 3 *et te* A.
 4 *curatores* C.
 13 *non-uitium* D. Conj.
 14 *nullius* C.
 30 *Virgilius* C.
 31 *haud* C.
 144, 1 *si* A.
 3 *ueneris* A.
natalis A.
Fortis A.
 12 *Nitidant abluunt* A marg.
 17 *circeo* D.
 18 *quapripedantur* A.
sonipedum A.
 20 *Nixurit* C.
 27 *immittunt*; C. Dist.
 29 *boias* A.
 145, 18 *anaticulas* C.
 24 *Nenia* C.
 26 *exhiberetur* A.
 28 *tibiis* C.
 146, 3 *fallaciae* C?
 14 *Plocio* A.C.
 20 *theo* D.
illius A.
 22 *illum* C.
 26 *ultroque* C.
 31 *Agamemnon-idis* Conj.
 33 *extinctas* \wedge iam A. Dist. *atque* A.
 147, 5 *hypouolyri* C.
 8 *Obstringillare* D.
 11 *obstringillant* D.
ignoscit A.
 18 *Obuarrare* D.
 20 *obuarrant* D.
 26 *Ossiculatim* D?
 148, 1 *peritoton* A.
 5 *pependerint* C.
 6 q[uaere] A marg.
 8 *si* C.
inteari traxero D. }
inter traxero C. }
 14 motur D.
 17 *Oecule* C.
 149, 10 *Places* E?
 15 *auri* C.
 16 *a mole* D.
 19 *substemini* D.
 22 *papulam* C.
 27 *Penniculamentum* D.
 28 *Annalis* A.

- 150, 38 *tonstrix* E?
inpulstrix E?
 39 *assestris* A marg.
 151, 1 *Omassum* D.
 3 *gliris* C.
 15 *colam* C.
 16 *q[uaere]* A marg.
 19 *portisculus* A.
 30 *perpezabile* } A marg.
 perplexum }
 34 *eminulis* A.
 152, 1 *quān* D.
 5 *pipulo* C.
 8 *quia* D.
 13 *Nec* A.
 15 *far* C.
 17 *Porcas* N.L.
 23 *sentinosas* C.
 27 *paries* C.
 putidus C.
 31 *id est exhibendo* A.
 153, 5 *Eumenidibus* A.
 6 *dicitur* C.
 10 *uteribus* C.
 11 *præfiscini* A.
 dictum est A.
 14 *pernititis pernicies* A marg.
 exitium C.
 17 *qui in* C. *negeste* C.
 35 *proferre* C.
 154, 9 *pape* *palestricos* C.
 17 *praesentem* D.
 19 *Minta* C.
 24 *pannibus* A.
 26 *propola* C.
 27 *protuli item* A. }
 item protuli D. }
 31 *lib. II.* A.
 155, 4 *Caecilius* A. marg.
 locio A. marg.
 5 *Properatim* A marg.
 istunc A. D.
 14 *præfracte* C.
 15 *His* A.
 16 *Aris-to* Conj.
 18 *pulcritudo* C.
 30 *pollendo* A.
 33 *pollere* A.
 34 *Propitiabilis* C.
 propitiando C.
 37 *pau* *Pauxillisper* D.
 156, 6 *Imbecilla* C.
 14 *sinit ætatula* A.
 16 *Sic* C.
 21 *lactis* C.
 24 *balat*, Dist.
 157, 1 *honestos* C.
 7 *Acaristione* C.
 13 *aegum* C.
 22 *caecilius* D.
 157, 25 *medici* C.
 discessum A.
 28 *capulum* C.
 158, 25 *addere* A.
 35 *Aegistho*; Dist.
 37 *lib. III.* C.
 41 *squamigerae* A.
 159, 27 *Protollere* A.
 differre; Dist.
 160, 11 *dolorum reste* C.
 13 *Perfica* Cap.
 25 *perfectum solum-tum* D. Conj.
 161, 5 *commoti hauto* D.C.
 ac C?
 8 *ut ait* C.
 9 *Pertidere* C.
 uel decidere C.
 10 *pertisum* C.
 21 *Tusculanorum* A.
 162, 4 *se permetterent* A.C.
 5 *Sisenna* A.
 14 *Varro* A.
 16 *ebore* C.
 18 *Populi Romani* A.
 19 *occultuque* D.
 21 *Educandis* A.
 22 *Etenim* A.
 27 *purpura-scit*, Conj. Dist.
 163, 1 *non egeremus* A.
 4 *ipsi* C.
 23 *obuiam* A.
 26 *Pondo Ducentum* A.
 saepe D.
 28 *ducentum* C.
 164, 17 *raui-m* Conj.
 23 *odiosam* C.
 26 *sed dominari* A marg.
 165, 10 *Reciproca* N.L.
 12 *rursus* C.
 24 *lib. II.* A.
 26 *aliter assit* C.
 30 *incredibiliter* A.
 32 *repuerascam* C.
 166, 2 *dolasti* C.
 6 *sputo* A.
 11 *orchestra* A.
 167, 1 *Rumiferare* A.
 9 *rutuba* C.
 16 *albigescit* D.
 recentatur A.
 18 *pro* A.
 20 *rapinator* C.
 28 *cunas rumine* A.
 168, 3 *granes*, Dist.?
 9 *uellicatim* C.
 11 *istilo* A.
 15 *scabre sordide putide* A marg.
 16 *illuue* C.
 19 *Censores* C.
 21 *strigosum* C.

- 168, 24 *sed si* A.
 169, 2 *achille* D.
 24 *Astyanactis* C.
 26 *Andromeda* C.
 27 *Scrupeo* C.
 34 *liquiquidum* D.
 37 *Scurriles* D ?
 170, 17 *Medo* C.
 18 *Populoque* A.
 22 *Prolautus* D.
 23 *illum* A ?; *simulter* A.
itidem A.
 171, 10 *abibis* A.
 16 *satu/lem* A.
 19, 20 *necessariam* A.
 22 *capud* D.C.
 26 *phœreus*; Dist.
 172, 5 *Actius* A.
 6 *crudelitatem* D.
satietas C.
 12 *termextrinorum* A marg.
 14 *satiasti* C.
 23 *illi* A.
 29 *Bacchidibus* A.
 173, 1 *Bacchidibus* A.
 4 *Turpidius* C.
 10 *ut mihi hi* A.
 21 *sodalis* C.
 22 *uerisace* D.
 25 *malī* C.
 174, 3 *dulubra* C.
 6 *scopuli* C.
 14 *argumenta-re* Conj.
dicunt Dist. C.
 23 *Aeneidis* A.
 31 *scelerati* C.
 32 *aetatem* A.
 38 *adducere* A.
 175, 2 *expuere* D.
 6 *fluctifrago* C.
 7 *Uuescun-t* A C. Conj. Dist.
 8 *Virgilius* C.
 20 *Mercatore* A.
 21 *Ita* A.
 27 *succendens* D.
 29 *et quo* C.
 31 *Superbiloquentia* Cap.
Tusculanorum A.
 32 *animique* C.
 33 *Sarcinatore* *sutorem* D.
lib. XXVIII. C.
 176, 1 *Sarcinatore* A.
centonem C.
 7 *a singulis* A.
 15 *adeo* C.
 26 *M. Crassus* C. (*linea suprascr.*)
 177, 2 *Salebras* C.
a saltu dictae D.
 3 *deuidere* C.
 8 *fluit* A.
 177, 9 *friuolum* C.
 18 *aut ab spartu quasi sparteas aut ab asportando* D.
 21 *enim* A.
 178, 7 *Tetinerit* A.
 22 *Euripidis* A.
 24 *minutim* D.
 25 *caluam* A.
comminuisssem A.
 31 *Parmenione* D.
 179, 7 *terti* A Dist.
mangonis A.
 24 *Melesia* A.
 26 *Tabificum* C.A.
 180, 3 *qui te* A.
 21 *cum machinato* A.
 23 *Tironem* A.
 24 *in re* A.
 27 *Ad oblectandos* C.
 28 *examinantur* A Dist.; *trutinare* D.
 181, 17 *Actius* A.
Alcmene A.
 26 *duraque* A.
 32 *atque* A.
cauda C.
 182, 12 *timorum-eno* Conj.
 16 *Logomacheia* D.
 26 *Virgilius* C.
 183, 1 *uegetat* A.
 9 *gubernans* A.
 24 *uerba* A.
obnuntiem C.
 30 *uehementi* C.
 32 *Sychaeum* A.
 36 *fallens* C.
 184, 1 *Actius* C.
 20 *lib. II* A.
 25 *Vastities* C.
 27 *uastities* C.
 29 *uastitudine* C.
 185, 5 *deserantur* C.
 11 *patiuntur* C.
 22 *uenerans* A.
 24 *Pacuius* C.
 186, 3 *erus* C.
 7 *Explodam* C.
uilicetur A.
 16 *blanditer* C.
 19 *Duos* A.
 23 *Historiarum* C.A.
 27 *ualentiam* C.
 187, 3 *frondens* D.
 6 *Asinariaria* D.
 7 *uoluptare* D.
 18 *uiracius* C.
q[uuere] A marg.
 24 *Verruncam* D.
 25 *quadringentos* C.
 26 *uerruncam* D.
 29 *insignitas* A.

- 187, 32 *aestate* A.
 188, 5 *proilio* C.
 15 *per uicos* D.
 16 *menses* A.
 18 *tristem* D.
 21 *tesserulae* C.
 22 *emble-mate* Conj.
 24 *cornelia ana* D.
 189, 14 *Tusculanorum* A.
 22 *eundulatis* A.
 26 *Zonatim* N.L.
 190, 7 *purgitanis* C.D.
 10 *peruium* C.
 12 *quoddam* A.
 24 *Absinthium* A.
 25 *Absinthia* A.
 28 *absinthium* A.
 33 *studere* C.
 191, 5 *his...se* A.
 7 *Virgilius* C.
 34 *amnem* C.
 35 *Feminino* A.
 192, 4 *hostico* C.
 7 *hac* A.
 29 *sedere* A marg. cum q[uaere].
 193, 12 *probasti* A.
 21 *annittetrach.* A.
 25 *inquaе* D.
 saluum D.
 194, 7 *Roscius* A.
 10 *infoebis* C.
 24 *Feminini* A.
 28 *blanditiam* A.
 195, 2 *depraessa* D.
 4 *Asparagi* C.
 et C.
 6 *formosamque* C.
 10 *Masculini* A.
 14 *Culter et* A.
 16 *Bithinia* A.
 27 *adcuratiusque* A.
 28 *po-litos* E. Conj.
 196, 3 *Quaerelae* Cap. D.
 13 *scripsisse* C.
 17 *Quaenam* C.
 27 *in marte* A.
 35 *caementa* A. }
 caementa D. }
 197, 6 *hi* \wedge *sunt* Dist. C.
 14 *his* A.
 29 *Quis* Cap.
 198, 14 *fulua* \wedge *cinis* E?
 15 *lib. II* A.
 16 *Quid* C.
 colluabellana D. }
 colu et lana C. }
 26 *Asinaria* C.
 30 *exercita* A.
 31 *Fere...eo* A.
 32 *Ratione* A.
 198, 32 *re* (lin. supraser.) D.
 37 *quale* C.
 199, 2 *pestilentia* C.
 4 *morbi* \wedge A. Dist.
 22 *disperuit* C.
 27 *libiso* D. }
 libro C. }
 28 *tum ut si* C.
 30 *Titono* C.
 31 *relinquit* A.
 33 *Virgil.* C.
 200, 3 *quies* A.
 \wedge *iret* Dist.
 caloremque C.
 10 *q[uaere]* A. marg.
 11 *breue est* C.
 14 *docet* D.
 16 *epigono* C.
 21 *necessimo* D.
 23 *Harpazomene* C.
 24 *praecidi* C.
 26 *restim* C.
 30 *collus* C.
 32 *Malae* A.
 barbara D.
 collus \wedge Dist.
 33 *Varro Sexagesi* A.
 34 *ut nitens pauonis collus* A.
 201, 8 *sit* A.
 14 *nite-t* Conj.
 acria C.
 ut est ut est D.
 18 *altus* A.
 22 *Marsus* C. marg.
 33 *contemptio* C.A.
 202, 1 *patientia* C.
 contemptio C.A.
 7 *pastusque* C.
 17 *procumbunt* C.
 21 *Neutri* C.
 26 *tibi* \wedge Dist?
 34 *puppis* C.
 203, 6 *genere masculino* C.
 nam D.
 feminino A.
 11 *animi* A.
 12 *Tusculanorum* A.
 13 *contemptione* C.A.
 20 *Feminini* A.
 22 *lib.* A.
 26 *reuocatur* C. marg.
 29 *Horrendamque* A. }
 Horrendamque C. }
 34 *quaecumque* D.
 204, 6 *adhortatus* A.
 conquirem A.
 12 *errantiae* D.
 14 *hirtium* D.
 22 *generis* A.
 205, 2 *neque ut* A.

- 205, 10 *Et* C.
19 *Historiarum* A.
35 *seranacae-caeli* Conj. D.
nomina C.
- 206, 21 *Petitore* C.
31 *aeneis* D.
35 *foco* C.
- 207, 1 *et aut ut* D.
regnum D.
6 *infra* C.
Vesuvium A.
7 *pertinebat* C.
31 *uerticulis* C.
33 *neutri generis* C.
Mattico A.
36 *uento* C.
- 208, 4 *libyi* D.
5 *uidentur* \wedge ire Dist.
21 *Satyrarum* A.
32 *iacent* C.
- 209, 2 *praetensus* A.
8 *atros* C ?
intribos D ?
16 *insaniam* A.
affert C.
19 *Marcopoli* A.
20 *portae* C.
clauaca C.
21 *generis* A.
22 *in...* C.
perfecto C.
hanc uideo D.
26 *desserendus* C.D.
27 *protheosilaodam* A.
28 *ineunt* C.
cachinnos A.
29 *dictarii sitantis* D.
- 210, 4 *Pelusiaca* A.
7 *romice* A.
11 *disripiamus* D.
13 *lucanam* A.
luci claro A.
14 *Hodie* A.
18 *luci* C.
queo A.
19 *neutri est* A.
20 *masculini* A.
23 *Labium* C. marg.
24 *reuellit* A.
26 *Age* C.
bibis-ti C. Conj.
refer C.
labeas tibeas C.
- 211, 3 *lib. II.* A.
7 *locos ut* C.
- 212, 7 *lauatrina* D.
20 *Georgicon* C.
32 *habuit* C.
34 *spero* \wedge rem A.C. Dist.
- 213, 2 *nobis* C.
- 213, 5 *profectus* C.
13 *crepitantes* D.
19 *qui* C.
20 *loquntur* C.
21 *Masculini* A.
23 *seminisse* D.
- 214, 8 *masculino* C.
Feminino A.
11 *Ni metus* A.
tennet \wedge D. Dist.
rite C.
13 *iacciti* D. C.
14 *depontaremur* A.
 \wedge uerus Dist. C.
15 *generis est* A.
muliebris A.
20 *miseriemunium* D.
22 *Nundinae* Cap.
neutri A.
23 *maius* C.
nigri qui C.A.
expectant A.
30 *Humanarum* A.
- 215, 6 *suraene* C.
12 *sicuti* A.
16 *neruias* C.
18 *tractare* C.
nouales C.
26 *amicos* \wedge Dist.
31 *esse* A ?
34 *obsequentiae* \wedge Dist.
35 *Fimbriana* C.
- 216, 1 *grauas* A.
5 *peloris* A.
6 *Demetrio* A.
9 *salo* C.
multinummus C.
16 *uidebant-ostream* Conj.
21 *nummum* C. '
39 *Ad puteos* C.A.
- 217, 1 *uel* A.
2 *maria* A.
5 *elegantis* A.
6 *cocis* C.
piscatu C.
13 *lib. III.* A.
14 *peperit* D.
24 *lib. II.* A.
retrimenta A.
26 *est* A.
28 *feminino* A.
- 218, 33 *cretam* C.
- 219, 18 *pigritia* C.
26 *stirpibus* C.
34 *praeberem* C.
- 220, 23 *inquit* C.
25 *porricere* C.
30 *subfurabatur* C.
- 221, 1 *Pistillus* C.
Nouius C.

- 221, 5 patinas C.
 7 *Munatius* C.
 10 saluete C.
 12 utaeque A.
 21 rideat C.
 23 nudantia C.
 33 Excussosque C.A.
 37 Sicihensi C.
 38 plenum C.
 222, 3 Ramenta C.
 5 propensior C.
 15 Feminini A.
 17 Rerum A.
 Tarquilinios D.
 18 gentilitatem (gen/til ex gent/il) C.
 21 Specus D.
 24 uirile et C.
 specus E.
 25 Tum in muro C.
 26 specus E.
 copuli C.
 28 admissam C.A.
 capriam D.
 223, 1 patebat C.
 3 scruposam C.A.
 4 feminineutri D?
 10 ullos C.
 17 commenontario D.
 18 facidem A.
 19 posttea D.
 28 sibiſſum D.
 33 Masculini A.
 37 sagus C.
 224, 11 cheu C. (repet. in marg).
 16 sanguine sanguen A.
 20 φθoπas A.
 35 Prometinensibus A.
 225, 12 Rerum C.
 scrobicululum D.
 19 genere appellatur Transposuit A.
 21 ah A.
 27 sic ^ e ^ tritico Dist. E. spicam D.
 226, 3 Telepho C.
 6 squales A.
 9 suasiones A.
 24 inquit C.
 227, 7 incrementa C.A.
 conmemorem C.
 11 saporum C.
 15 screpitus C.
 16 uetuetorum D.
 228, 14 acceperint A.
 23 ingenua C.
 25 crastinate A.
 27 Ut A.
 29 lanea C.
 infectori C.
 32 tribulasque A.
 34 apud A.
 229, 4 obprepsit A.
- 229, 5 Caecilius A.
 16 tu pleni C.
 cum in A.
 operis toro ^ A. Dist.
 22 Varro Dist. (punct. supra o).
 32 Plauptus D.
 34 Philopatro C.
 230, 4 generis A.
 6 Georgicon C.
 21 concitat C.
 22 Aeneidos A.
 27 discicit A.
 29 bellum C.
 31 combureret C.
 32 sic centum D.
 33 Aupas C.
 muſi C.
 231, 5 solis C.
 12 claudunt A.
 15 hypocorisma A.
 16 Decedo cacatum A.
 22 mox Fufidius C.
 24 suadum D.
 oportuniore C.
 26 Masculini C.
 30 aethera A.
 32 Heautontimorumenos A.
 libro VII. D.
 33 uesperis A.
 232, 2 expectecti C.
 4 potius C.
 uigilius C.
 adminicularem C.
 quid D.
 uidet C.
 alium C.
 11 PER LITTERAS A.

[The following corrections should be made in the portion of the article which appeared in the November number.]

9, 17 coagmentata C. 15, 15 pater. The correction may be by F². 20, 51 ^ —das E. Conj. C. 27, 13 EKZOTHCOΔOY A. 28, 17 fulguris C. 29, 25 medium est sic A.E† D. 50, 17 after quaeſitas add has apertissimas potuimus inuenire. 56, 13 amfinionis D. 67, 9 solitamattibias C. 74, 9 illo is added by F². 18 pinnis is corrected by F². 76, 18 puerit D. 81, 32 (not 29) comesque is corrected by F². 84, 8 pallium obseruabam A. 86, 14 humili. The h is added by F². 87, 33 ocicerem D. 91, 13 meuis D. 92, 19 calfacimur C. 94, 26 compito is corrected by F². 98, 29 uelutatis C. 99, 24 satius C. 100, 11 dimissum is corrected by F². 102, 4 euallauero is corrected by F². 103, 10 pro ^ errans is corrected by F². 108, 15

This q[uaere] probably refers to 107, 26. 110, 14, 22; 114, 9. Omit these notes. 118, 25, insulae ueneris D. 120, 13 marini. The addition is by F².

The following instances of erasure should be omitted since there is nothing to connect them definitely with F³: 3, 28; 13, 3; 17, 30; 19, 23; 21, 1; 21, 5; 26, 12; 26,

24; 27, 15; 28, 31; 29, 4; 29, 12; 32, 10; 34, 10; 34, 22; 34, 23; 35, 31; 37, 17; 38, 10; 41, 22; 42, 2; 43, 20; 44, 7; 44, 31; 45, 20; 47, 9; 50, 7; 50, 8; 55, 19; 56, 12; 58, 1; 108, 27.

J. WOOD BROWN.
(Florence).

SUSEMIHL AND HICKS' EDITION OF THE *POLITICS*.

The Politics of Aristotle, a Revised Text, with Introduction, Analysis, and Commentary, by F. SUSEMIHL and R. D. HICKS: Books I.-V. (Macmillan & Co. 1894.) 18s. net.

In this volume we have Books I.-V. of Prof. Susemihl's well-known *Aristoteles Politik Griechisch und Deutsch und mit sachklärenden Anmerkungen* (1879) reproduced in an English dress by Mr. Hicks. Extensive additions and corrections have been made by both editors in the Introduction and Commentary, and by Prof. Susemihl in the Critical Notes; but an English Translation of the Greek text has been dispensed with.

There is much to be said for the plan of naturalizing, as it were, a good foreign edition in England—of rewriting it in English, as distinguished from merely translating it. I confess that I was at first a little disappointed on finding that it is only to a very limited extent that Mr. Hicks has rewritten Prof. Susemihl for English readers. But second thoughts soon satisfied me that he could not well have done more. Prof. Susemihl, as all students of Aristotle will acknowledge with gratitude, is so rich in various detail, and especially in exact and minute reference to, and criticism of, the opinions of other workers in his department, that it would have been impossible for Mr. Hicks to do justice to the peculiar characteristics of the original except by fairly close translation. Further, Prof. Susemihl's Aristotelian work is always so much in process of building, as it were, that it would have been premature to attempt to make it more acceptable to English readers by clearing away the scaffolding—by omitting, at the present stage, detail which would certainly confuse one's view of more finished results. Indeed, one of the chief objects of the collaboration of Prof. Susemihl and Mr. Hicks on this edition is to add to the

detail, and for this we are, in the present state of the study of the *Politics*, only bound to be grateful.

This English edition, then, is still essentially a workman's edition like its German original, which it corrects and elaborates in countless details—it is still a characteristic product of 'the German workshop,' a book of reference brought up to date, which no serious student of Aristotle can do without, but not very 'readable':—I say 'not very readable,' it will be easily understood, without implying the least disparagement. English students, at least, of Aristotle's Political Philosophy will continue to read Mr. Newman's 'superb Introduction,' as Mr. Hicks justly and well characterizes it, and Jowett's Introduction and Analysis, in order to obtain an entire and clear view of the subject. Professor Susemihl's Introduction, which is short and has less than the usual amount of detail, will be found useful by the side of these larger aids. It ought to be noted that Prof. Susemihl's Introduction, even in its English form, is prior to Mr. Newman's two volumes. Pages 1-460 of the present volume had been printed off before the appearance of Mr. Newman's volumes, as Mr. Hicks explains in apologizing for the long delay between the announcement and publication of the work. Certain points, however, in Mr. Newman's volumes are noticed in Addenda (pp. 659 ff.), and in the important Note on the basis of the text (pp. 460-468), in which Prof. Susemihl reaffirms his old position, *haud raro* Π², *saepius* Π¹ *meliozem*, against Mr. Newman, who believes (vol. i. pref. viii.) that 'any future recension of the text of the *Politics* should be based primarily on MSS. of the second family (Π²).'

The general conclusions which we are bound, I think, to come to with regard to this new edition are—that, so far as critical apparatus is concerned, it is simply indis-

pensable: that, as for the Commentary taken as a whole, Mr. Hicks is justified in his hope that it 'will be found [with the Addenda] more adequate than any of its predecessors to our existing materials and means of information'—'taken as a whole,' for Mr. Newman's Commentary, though equally adequate (except that, of course, it has no references to the 'Aθ. Πολ. : cf. especially references in the Addenda of this edition, pp. 678-681), so far as it goes, and more finished in form, is at present confined to two Books: lastly, that Prof. Susemihl's Introduction, though scarcely challenging comparison with the Introduction of Mr. Newman, will be found useful by the side of it. I should like to add that the new section of the Introduction—on 'The most recent criticism of the Text'—for which Mr. Hicks is largely responsible, seems to me to treat a subject (I refer especially to 'Dislocations and Double Recensions'), which is admittedly full of *διαφορὰ καὶ πλάνη*, with great judgment.

I may be allowed now to refer to some points of detail which I have noted in reading this new edition.

P. 151 (cf. p. 667), A. 2, 1253 a 33. *χαλεπωτάτη γὰρ ἀδικία ἔχουσα ὅπλα· ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ὅπλα ἔχων φύεται φρονήσει καὶ ἀρετῇ, οἷς ἐπὶ τὰναντία ἔστι χρῆσθαι μάλιστα. διὸ ἀνοσιώτατον καὶ ἀγριώτατον ἄνευ ἀρετῆς.* Here Prof. Susemihl reads *φρονήσει καὶ ἀρετῇ* in the text, although he suggests that *ἀρετῇ* may be due to 36 *ἀρετῆς* having displaced a word like *καρτερία*. His translation (German edition, p. 87) is 'der Mensch hat die natürlichen Waffen in Händen durch seine angeborne Klugheit und Willensstärke'; and in the Addenda to the present edition (p. 667) it is explained that 'Prudence and [virtue] are the qualities at whose disposal the weapons are placed.' It seems to me that, with Conring and Madvig, we ought simply to bracket *φρονήσει καὶ ἀρετῇ*. I take these words to be an ignorant and stupid gloss set on the margin against *οἷς*, the construction of the interpolated datives being, like that of *οἷς* which they gloss, with *χρῆσθαι*.

P. 172, A. 8, 1256 a 11. *ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὐχ ἡ αὐτὴ τῇ οἰκονομικῇ ἢ χρηματιστικῇ, δῆλον· πότερον δὲ μέρος αὐτῆς ἐστὶ τι ἢ ἕτερον εἶδος ἔχει διαμφισβήτησιν, εἰ γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦ χρηματιστικοῦ θεωρῆσαι πόθεν χρήματα καὶ κτήσις ἔσται. ἡ δὲ κτήσις πολλὰ περιέειλε μέρη καὶ ὁ πλοῦτος, ὥστε πρῶτον ἢ γεωργικῇ πότερον μέρος τι τῆς οἰκονομικῆς ἢ ἑτερόν τι γένος, καὶ καθόλου ἢ περὶ τὴν τροφὴν ἐπιμέλεια [καὶ κτήσις].* Here Prof. Susemihl, following Vahlen, takes *εἰ γὰρ* as = *εἴπερ* = 'if namely,' and

puts a full stop after *ἔσται*. Mr. Newman, with a full stop [or colon] after *διαμφισβήτησιν*, and a comma after *ἔσται*, makes the apodosis begin with *ὥστε*—the preferable construction, I think; unless, indeed we make *ἡ δὲ κτήσις . . .* the apodosis (see Eucken, *de partic. usu*, p. 26): 'it is an arguable point whether *χρηματιστική* is a part of *οἰκονομική*, or something quite different; for while, on the one hand, it is true that the *χρηματιστικός* is concerned specially with the *κτήσις χρημάτων*, which seems to lie outside the sphere of *οἰκονομική*, on the other hand (*δέ*), *κτήσις* has many other parts, with which too the *χρηματιστικός* may be said to be concerned—e.g. *γεωργική*: accordingly, the first question we have to ask is whether e.g. *γεωργική* is a part of *οἰκονομική*, or something quite different.' I cannot agree with Prof. Susemihl and Mr. Hicks that *πότερον* after *γεωργική*, line 17, 'is dependent, like *πόθεν*, line 15, upon *ἔστι τοῦ χρηματιστικοῦ θεωρῆσαι*.'

P. 241, B. 5, 1264 a 18. *τί διοίσουσιν οὗτοι ἐκείνων τῶν φυλάκων; ἡ τί πλείον τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἢ τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτῶν; ἡ τί παθόντες ὑπομενοῦσι τὴν ἀρχήν, ἐὰν μὴ τι σοφίζονται κ.τ.λ.* Bernays (see his German translation of the first three Books of the *Politics*), following Aretinus, omits *ἡ τί πλείον τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν τὴν ἀρχήν*, and transposes *αὐτῶν* to follow *ἀρχήν* 20—rightly. I take it that the clause *ἡ τί παθόντες ὑπομενοῦσι τὴν ἀρχήν* was accidentally written twice, and that afterwards the first member of the ditto-graph was altered into *ἡ τί πλείον τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν τὴν ἀρχήν*. ΠΑΘΟΝΤΕΣ would easily suggest ΠΛΕΟΝΤΟΙΣ.

P. 244, B. 5, 1264 b 10. I do not feel sure that I have caught the point of Dr. Jackson's note here—it ought to be mentioned that a valuable feature of this new edition is constituted by notes, critical and exegetical, supplied by Dr. Jackson, and printed throughout the work with his signature: 'Aristotle apparently does not observe that Plato's myth does not answer its purpose, as it does not recognize the promotion of *ἐπίκουροι* to be *φύλακες*.' Is the myth (*Rep.* iii. 415 A) inconsistent with the promotion of *ἐπίκουροι* to be *φύλακες*, i.e. *ἄρχοντες*? Golden youths serve as *ἐπίκουροι*, and become at last *ἄρχοντες*. It is only through such service that the golden—and only the golden—rise to become *ἄρχοντες*. Silver natures remain always *ἐπίκουροι*.

P. 357, Γ. 1, 1275 a 35. Prof. Susemihl, in the German translation, and Mr. Hicks, in his note *ad loc.*, take *ὑποκείμενα* to mean

'individual members' of a class. But in the sentence 1275 a 38 τὰς δὲ πολιτείας . . . 1275 b 5 πολιτεῖαν, which illustrates the law formulated in the sentence 1275 a 34 δεῖ δὲ μὴ λανθάνειν . . . a 38 γλίσχρως, it is plain (as the two editors seem to admit) that τὰς πολιτείας answer to τὰ ὑποκείμενα, and τὸν πολίτην answers to τῶν πραγμάτων. Hence τὰ ὑποκείμενα must be the conditions (according to a common use of the term) with which the πράγματα correspond: where conditions, say, of life—salt water, fresh water, air—differ profoundly, the creatures respectively corresponding with these different conditions will themselves differ profoundly.

P. 369, Γ, 4, 1277 a 5. ἔτι ἐπεὶ . . . a 12 παραστάτων. Prof. Susemihl brackets this passage because 'these constituents are not all citizens in the sense of the definition given iii. 1, 2 [1274 b 39 ff.], and yet this alone is material here (Thurot). In fact this whole argument is so absurd that I cannot bring myself to attribute it to Aristotle. The interpolation may be due to a gross misapprehension of ii. 2, 3 [1261 a 22 ff.]. I think that this note applies too stringently a principle which critics seem to consider especially applicable (I have great doubt about its being especially applicable) to the writings of the Father of Logic—the principle of rejecting as interpolated what is not logical in itself, or in relation to the context. If Aristotle had said simply ἔτι ἐπεὶ ἐξ ἀνομοίων ἡ πόλις, ἀνάγκη μὴ μίαν εἶναι τὴν τῶν πολιτῶν πάντων ἀρετὴν, the remark would have escaped suspicion—but, to illustrate ἐξ ἀνομοίων, he added ὥσπερ ζῶον εὐθὺς ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος καὶ ψυχῇ ἐκ λόγου καὶ ὀρέξεως. If he had stopped here he might still perhaps have passed for himself; but he adds another illustration, καὶ οἰκία ἐξ ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς καὶ κτῆσις ἐκ δεσπότου καὶ δούλου, which betrays him into the unfortunate τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ πόλις ἐξ ἀπάντων τε τούτων καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἐξ ἄλλων ἀνομοίων συνέστηκεν εἰδῶν—unfortunate, because, although the πόλις is composed of οἰκία, and therefore of their 'dissimilar parts,' he ought not thus to have coupled these 'dissimilar parts' with other 'dissimilar parts' of the πόλις, viz. its πολῖται, obtained by the application of a different principle of division. But surely it is quite like Aristotle to do this—to drift into the mention of 'dissimilar parts' in οἰκία merely as a further illustration of the notion of 'dissimilar parts,' and then get a little confused by the occurrence of the thought that, after all, the 'dissimilar

parts' of οἰκία are also (i.e. as well as πολῖται) parts of πόλις. Surely confusion like this is Aristotelian enough—indeed, I think, even more characteristic of Aristotle himself than of his followers and commentators.

P. 371, Γ, 4, 1277 a 26. καὶ πολίτου δοκίμον ἢ ἀρετὴ εἶναι κ.τ.λ. This is the reading of the new English edition, but the *nova impressio* (Teubner) published in 1894 (i.e. after p. 371 of the English edition was in type) adopts Dr. Jackson's conjecture δοκεῖ πον ἢ for the δοκίμον of, apparently, all MSS. As there is nothing in the Addenda to the English edition about the reading, one is left in doubt as to whether Prof. Susemihl stands by δοκεῖ πον ἢ, or has reverted from that conjecture to the MSS.

P. 375, Γ, 4, 1277 b 29. I cannot entirely agree with what Prof. Susemihl says in his note here on δόξα ἀληθής: "Right opinion" of this sort [i.e. of the sort intended here] does not by any means correspond, as Eaton thinks, with that to which Plato applies the term, simply because the φρόνησις to which Plato often opposes it (as in *Laws* i. 632 C) coincides with philosophic knowledge.' I cannot but think that the πίστις ὀρθή, or δόξα ὀρθή, of the passage *Rep.* x. 601 C—602 A was in Aristotle's mind when he wrote 1277 b 28 ff., and that his example—αἰλοποιός—αἰλητής—borrowed from that passage, as Prof. Susemihl notes, shows that he did not, at any rate consciously here, make a difference between his own and Plato's use of δόξα ὀρθή.

Pp. 388, 9, Γ, 8, 1279 b 38. Prof. Susemihl inserts διά, and reads διαφοράς. But surely the received text (with διαφορὰς) gives a perfectly easy and natural construction: 'Take διαφορὰς as a genitive, making αἰτίας the predicate, and repeating the word with ῥηθείσας—"and thus the so called causes of difference are not real causes"' (Jowett). Τὰς ῥηθείσας αἰτίας are those implied in the composition of the words ὀλιγαρχία and δημοκρατία. Bernays, inserting πολιτείας after ῥηθείσας, seems to understand the reference to be to the πολιτεῖαι in which (1) the rich rulers happen to be many and (2) the poor rulers happen to be few (τὰς ἄρτι λεχθείσας πολιτείας of line 31 above); but surely it is harsh to say 'the constitutions mentioned are not causes of specific difference': if constitutions differ specifically, there is something to cause them so to differ—they do not themselves 'cause' their own specific difference.

Pp. 478–490, H, 2, 3. Prof. Susemihl brackets 1324 a 13 ἀλλὰ . . . 1325 b 34

πρότερον, i.e. H. 2 and 3. It would take too much space to epitomize Prof. Susemihl's reasons for bracketing this passage; but they seem to me to depend ultimately on the assumption that a canonical writer's order will be lucid, and that he will not repeat himself very clumsily. I venture to submit to the judgment of those who will read Prof. Susemihl's notes, pp. 478-490, the following sketch of the train of thought in the bracketed passage, in the belief that they will find it consistent with itself and with chapters 1 and 4: 'There are two questions which must be considered now—1. Is the active, political, or the detached, studious life better for the *individual*? and 2. What is the Best Constitution of the State? Question 1 is a *πάρεργον*. It gets answered in the answer to question 2, which is the *ἔργον*. The issue involved in question 2 is Ought the State to make its own all-round perfection, or foreign conquest its end? Its own all-round perfection, of course. But, although the Best State will find its end within itself, the organic functions by which it attains to the end will still be *practical* functions—and practical in the highest sense, *like the free-thought of the Philosopher*.' Thus the two questions, *πάρεργον* and *ἔργον*, are answered together, in a pregnant manner very characteristic of Aristotle: 'That State is Best which is like the Philosopher.' In reply to Prof. Susemihl's remark (p. 480, n. 717) 'The author is in error in supposing that the question, whether scientific or political activity ranks highest for the individual, corresponds exactly to the question which arises with regard to the State, whether it should pursue a policy of peace or of war'—it may be sufficient to say that the point of correspondence is that the political life of the individual and the military policy of the State are both *ἄσχολοι* (*E.N.* x. 7, 6): it is in *σχολή* that the true end for both individual and State is given. The words 1324 a 13 ἀλλὰ ταῦτ' ἤδη δύο ἐστὶν ἃ δέεται σκέψεως with which the passage

bracketed by Prof. Susemihl begins seem to refer naturally enough to 1324 a 3 διασκεπτέον ὕστερον: 'there are other points which may be discussed afterwards; but two questions it is now time (ἤδη) to go into.' The whole bracketed passage seems to me to be, at worst, as coherent with itself and its surroundings as many other passages which have escaped brackets. Indeed, it is difficult to understand what exactly brackets, marking off lengthy passages, mean to an editor who holds that 'unquestionably the treatise [the *Politics*] consists of different component parts, written at different times, with different aims, though ultimately incorporated in a single scheme (Addenda, p. 662).' My difficulty is about 'ultimately incorporated.' Are we to understand that a time can be (even approximately) fixed, after which substantial additions were made which ought to be bracketed?

P. 519, H. 11, 1330 a 36. αὐτῆς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶναι τὴν θέσιν εὐχεσθαι δεῖ κατατυγχάνειν πρὸς τέτταρα δὴ βλέποντας. This, the reading of the MSS., is adopted by Prof. Susemihl, who fully discusses the difficulties of construction. I would suggest that the almost impossible κατατυγχάνειν represents κατ' εὐχὴν εἶναι: that Aristotle wrote αὐτῆς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν εἰ δεῖ κατ' εὐχὴν εἶναι τὴν θέσιν, εὐχεσθαι δεῖ πρὸς τέτταρα δὴ βλέποντας: that a scribe, misled by the recurrence of εἰ (εἰ δεῖ and εἶναι), omitted δεῖ κατ' εὐχὴν εἶ—: and that the words κατ' εὐχὴν εἶναι afterwards found their way back from the margin into the text after the wrong δεῖ, and were there corrupted into κατατυγχάνειν.

I have only to add that I hope that the publication of the remaining three Books, and Index, will not be long delayed. With an Index of the kind we have learnt to expect from Prof. Susemihl, the value of this edition—which I have ventured to describe summarily as 'an indispensable book of reference brought up to date'—will be vastly increased.

J. A. STEWART.

SMYTH'S IONIC DIALECT.

The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects. Ionic. By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH. Oxford. At the Clarendon Press. 1894. 24s.

THE author of this book of 668 pages has produced a treatise which has had no prede-

cessor in the subject with which it deals. It is strange that such a work has been so long in coming, for of all Greek dialects, apart from Attic, surely the Ionic, from its extent, from the intrinsic value of many of its records and from the romantic history of the people who spoke it, has always been

to scholars the most interesting of all the Greek dialects. Yet it is now more than half a century since the two volumes of Ahrens' great work were published, and though in recent times two other scholars have again taken up the task of summarizing the peculiarities of the Greek dialects they have as yet only retitled the ground which Ahrens had ploughed before them. The truth is that the extent of its records and the textual difficulties which beset the path of the investigator at every step have caused Ionic to be left alone till now, except for researches into the dialect of Herodotus and a previous publication of the present author on the Ionic vowel-system.

Professor Smyth has obviously spared no effort to make his investigation thorough and complete. The evidence for every point of phonology and morphology is carefully collected and marshalled. The inscriptions as being the genuine records prepared by the hands of the people themselves have naturally the foremost place. But after all, for such an important district, the inscriptions of Ionia are scanty and suffer from the usual limitations of official documents. As his second line the author brings forward the non-epic poets of Ionia, the writers of iambics being regarded as the best exponents of the popular dialect. Behind these come the manuscripts of Herodotus and Hippocrates. Nor is the Ionic element of the Epic poetry neglected. Finally the treatises of the pseudo-Ionists of a later age are carefully examined, although their evidence is precisely of the same value as that of an English-born novelist when he writes Scotch or of a Yorkshire novelist when he tries to compose in the dialect of Wessex. Besides these authorities the grammarians have been ransacked for their quotations of Ionic words.

The labour expended upon the complete and accurate citation of all these authorities must have been enormous. It was a work to be done and done once for all. But its very completeness is in one sense a defect of the book. The reader is in constant danger of losing grip of the principles amid an intricate forest of details. These details are in some cases put in tabular form, and many readers will probably desire that this plan had been followed oftener than it is. For it is impossible to make literature of names and references, and if the whole evidence with the exception of such disputed points as required longer discussion had been put in tabular

form nothing would have been lost and something would have been gained.

It is a pity that with all this labour the accuracy of all the results could not be assured. But, as the author complains, in the case even of an important author like Hippocrates there is at present no text which gives clearly, correctly and fully the readings of the manuscripts. In this respect therefore, and possibly in some others, the forthcoming edition of Hippocrates and probable discoveries of inscriptions in the future will necessitate corrections. But the author has at least the gratification of knowing that the present treatise must form the basis of all future work upon the history of the Ionic dialect.

In one respect the book is at present defective. It contains no syntax. It is true that from the inscriptions not much of syntactical value can be gleaned, but a treatise of this size ought not to have been published without giving us what there is to be found special to Ionic in the inscriptions and the literature. It is necessary to emphasize this point because, though no definite statement is made on the matter, the title and references to sections on Aeolic and Arcadian lead us to suppose that this work is the first of a series which will include, it may be hoped, all the Greek dialects. It may also be gathered from § 21 that the author holds that phonology and inflexion alone determine dialect character, a view that has become prevalent from the greater attention that has been devoted in recent years to these parts of grammar as compared with syntax. It is no doubt true in the case of spoken dialects that peculiarities in pronunciation and word-formation are more noticeable because they occur more frequently than syntactical differences. But in dealing with language as it appears in writing, the case is somewhat different, especially where the style is official or the treatise belongs to a literary school. In this case the native dialect will, if anywhere, appear in the syntax. It was neither in the phonology nor in the inflexions of the language written by David Hume and Adam Smith that Walter Bagehot discovered those irritating peculiarities which to his mind marked them as un-English. It was in the idiom, the order of words, the delicate syntactical constructions which speakers of a dialect closely akin and yet different find it much harder to master than do absolute foreigners. To trace these peculiarities in a dead dialect is no doubt extremely difficult, but that does not make

it less worth doing, and the few syntactical notes which occur in his discussion of the conjunctions and elsewhere makes us wish that Mr. Smyth had given us a full treatment of the subject.

The investigator of Ionic has to deal with many questions which interest scholars who are not primarily concerned with dialectology. Of these three may be mentioned: the Homeric dialect, the relation of Attic to Ionic and the question of contracted and uncontracted forms in Herodotus. On all of these the author speaks with no uncertain sound. He promises that in the discussion of Aeolic (or, as he spells it, Aiolic) 'the view will be advanced, that the appearance of the Aiolic ingredient can with propriety be reconciled with the general Ionic colouring of the whole only when it is seen that the dialect of the Homeric poems is, in greater or less degree, an Ionized Aiolic.' The relation of Homer's dialect to late Ionic is thus set forth (p. 41): 'It is difficult to discover any phonetic change of the fifth century (occurring in a word found also in Homer) which does not appear in some portion of the epic.' Ionic and Attic he holds (p. 67) to be 'essentially separate and individual dialects; and the argument which seeks to explain the Ionism of Attic tragedy as Old Atticisms, that is as survivals of the period when Ionic and Attic were still undistinguished, builds upon a false foundation.' He holds (p. 97) that 'against the united voice of iambists and stone records the fluctuating orthography of Herodoteian or Hippokratic MSS. can make no stand.' One other point of general interest to scholars may be mentioned, viz. the ingenious defence (p. 582) of the form *τεθνᾶναι* which has perplexed so many generations of critics in the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus. One important point remains unsolved—the relation of κ to π forms in *ὄκως* etc., although κ forms are shown to exist also in Aeolic.

For the philological treatment of the many linguistic difficulties which occur, there can be nothing but praise. A few points where greater clearness is desirable may be mentioned here. P. 20 § 17. Is it not reasoning in a circle to give the name of the mountain in Chios as *Πελοναῖον* on the authority of a Thessalian name *Πέλινα* and then claim it as an example of Aeolism in Chios? P. 22. The arguments to show that Herodotus must have written in the dialect of Miletus rather than in that of Halicarnassus or Samos seem very inconclusive. The influence of Miletus was greater

in the sixth century than in the fifth, and it does not follow that a writer whose period comes after its downfall should have felt the influence of Miletus so much. The author indeed admits as much in § 19. P. 69 § 74 (2). The Attic accent of *μυριάδων*, *χίλιαδων* seems most easily explained as arising from the analogy of stems in *-δης*. P. 144. Whatever the probability of a difference in root grade between *ἑσσοῦμαι* and *ἥσσω*, *ἑσς* and *ἑσείος* are a very doubtful parallel. The better spelling of the latter is *setius* (Lindsay *Lat. Lang.* 566). P. 146 n. 2. It is not made clear why the locative of *ναῦς* should be *ναῦει*. The same applies to *πολίσι* (§ 482) as the locative plural of *πόλις*. P. 152. It seems doubtful whether the form *χλάνδιον* should be regarded as a syncope of *χλανίδιον*, especially when there are no better parallels than *Ἰππώνδης* and Boeotian names in *-ωνδας*. We know that fashions in dress spread in Greece as elsewhere, and I should doubt whether either *χλάνδιον* or the more common *ἱμάτιον* (p. 205) have any great value for the restoration of the primitive language. The latter is certainly a very narrow basis for the philological deductions made by some of the authorities quoted. § 147. Why here and elsewhere prosthetic instead of prothetic? The latter is surely more accurate and more intelligible. P. 155 (and 604). The interesting form *HYPIY* proves that at the time of the founding of Cumae, whence it comes, *v* was still *u* not *ü* and had remained so there, but it will prove nothing for the later pronunciation of its metropolis. P. 164. The view that is taken of *μᾶλλον* seems to raise more difficulties than it solves. It seems easier to admit that the accent of *μᾶλλον* is founded on an erroneous hypothesis and should be *μάλλον*. P. 165 (and 233). The explanation of *καρδοκέω* should be somewhat longer. It is not easy to see why the verb should contain a plural noun (if that is meant) nor how the meaning arises. P. 179. It would make the connection of *ῥηχίη* with *ῥάχis* clearer to point out that in Attic Greek the word first occurs as applied to the reefs washed by the sea. P. 185. How does *-ωγ* occur in *ῥέγιον*? In § 210 and elsewhere anaptyxis is used in a somewhat different sense from the ordinary. To call the *ι* in *παλαιστή* anaptyctic is not to explain it. P. 205. The explanation of the history of *παίσομαι* (from *πάσχω*) and *πέισμα* seems less simple and less satisfactory than Brugmann's. P. 219 (and 535). *ἀκούω* can hardly have derived its *ου* from the future and aorist. The form *ἀκέω* has to be reckoned with.

P. 281. It can hardly be doubted that πλεῦμων is an older form for the lung than πνεύμων. The Greeks like the English named the lungs from their lightness, not their function. § 267, 2. Delete the illustration of σσω, which is an obvious slip. P. 294. Is it not more likely that the shifting of χ-κ, etc., in the Ionic dialect arose from the weakening of the aspiration in the one consonant than from its strengthening in the other? At § 361 πατήρ from Thasos might be mentioned as well as πατήρ, there being thus a parallel to φρήρη as well as to φρατρία. § 367. Why should it pass belief that the Ionians borrowed a Doric word concerning the sea? The view that people never borrow words for things with which they are familiar is erroneous. If accepted for the English language it would lead to some very strange results. P. 311. It is not clear what are the great difficulties in the way of connecting κοινός with Lat. *com-* (not *con-*). P. 315. The reminiscence of Homeric style even in the popular poetry might be paralleled by the continuance in English of such rhymes as *love* and *move* long after the words had become far separated (except dialectically) in pronunciation. P. 465 n. 2. The explanation of the η augment in ἤβουλόμεν etc., as from a preposition in ἐθέλω, ἠθέλω (lost except in imperfect), is extremely doubtful. This seems one of the numerous cases in recent philology which sin against the rule *causae praeter necessitatem non multiplicandae*. P. 519. The statement regarding aorists does not appear easily reconcilable with the view that the stems of the future and of the -s- aorist are identical.

I have observed the following misprints

which it may be worth while to correct. P. 19 § 14, 297 for 295. P. 21 n. Ὀη for Ὅη. P. 149 εἴεσται for -οῖ. P. 188, last line but one, 286 for 287. P. 203 *dācati* for *dācati*. P. 204 Στενίχλαρος. P. 229 οῖς from *dos*. Add out of *ου(σ)ος § 266. P. 304. For root *pāi* read *pōi*. P. 341 (in table) *gen.* *γαμας for *γαφιας. P. 386 n. 1 φυλακος wants accent (on first). P. 447, last line but two of § 563, ἀσατῶ? P. 468 n. line 4 ἀγγέλω for ἀγγέλλω. P. 507, last line, read γεγένηται. § 615 line 4 read δεδόκημαι. At p. 559 some words such as 'In the prose writers' are wanting at the beginning of the second paragraph.

The style of the book at the beginning is crabbed and full of Germanisms, but improves as it goes on. On p. 306 there is a very curious mixed metaphor. Is it too great a demand to ask Professor Smyth in his other volumes to drop such an ugly hybrid as *prosaist*? Herodotus' feelings towards the person who described him so might be imagined as belonging to the order of things which he thought it well on the present occasion not to mention.

Having thus discharged the duties of the *advocatus diaboli* I can in conclusion only thank the author for his excellent book and wish for the early appearance of another volume on some other of the Greek dialects which have not yet been treated. At present, with Meister's and Hoffmann's work still fresh, we can afford to wait for Aeolic. Will not Mr. Smyth give us Doric or the North-West dialects which he has already treated so well in brief in the *American Journal of Philology*?

P. GILES.

BUCK'S OSCAN-UMBRIAN VERB-SYSTEM.

CARL DARLING BUCK.—*The Oscan-Umbrian Verb-System*. (Preprint from Volume I. of the *University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology*, pp. 124-187.) Chicago. 1895.

INVESTIGATION of the Italic dialects is of recent date and comparatively few scholars have so far worked in this new and attractive field. But if progress, for these reasons, has been slow, it has, on the other hand, been steady and singularly free from empty and valueless contributions. If there have been not many *υαθηκοφόροι* those who did

engage in the work were βάκχοι, and a new treatise has always marked a decided step in advance.

In the line of Oscan and Umbrian phonology the three most important contributions were all made in the year 1892, when Bronisch and Buck gave their exhaustive discussion of the Oscan vowel-system and von Planta his careful and detailed survey of the whole field of Oscan and Umbrian phonetics. The general outlines thus being settled only minor points remain here open for discussion.

A systematic treatment and comprehen-

sive presentation of the scattered facts of Morphology and Syntax, similar to that given by von Planta for Phonology, we still lack, and the present work of Buck proposes to fill this want as far as the Oscan and Umbrian verb-system is concerned. He thus anticipates part of what we may expect in not too long a time from the pen of von Planta in the promised second volume of his *Grammar*. For the Latinist the gain is twofold. He will have the opinions of two specialists on controverted points when von Planta's second volume shall have appeared, and he will find the material in Buck's work grouped in such a manner that its arrangement may be more convenient for his immediate needs and purposes. For it may be expected from the disposition in the first volume that von Planta will follow Brugmann also in the arrangement of the morphological part, *i.e.* that he will start from the inferred Indo-European forms and trace their development within the individual language, a method which will force him to separate originally heterogeneous forms which the individual language has welded into one system (the Latin perfect is an extreme case) and which it treats as homogeneous. Buck's arrangement, on the other hand, is more that of Schleicher, which starts with the actual facts of the individual language and unravels them by the help of the light thrown on them by Indo-European philology.¹ 'It is,' he states, 'with more especial reference to possible readers among the Latinists that I give a synopsis of the Oscan-Umbrian Verb on the basis of the traditional system of conjugations and further attempt a general comparison of the Oscan-Umbrian verb-system with that of the Latin.'

With this aim in view he gives first a tabular view of the Oscan-Umbrian verbal paradigm in the traditional (Latin) arrangement (pp. 125-130). This is followed by a general comparison of the Oscan and Umbrian verb-system with that of the Latin (pp. 131-150). In this section lies the chief interest of the monograph for every Latinist. For the points of similarity of the two systems are numerous and outweigh by far the points of difference. Barring the absence of a pluperfect which may be accidental, the only real divergences

in the *categories* of the verb-system are confined to the *verbum infinitum*, where the Oscan lacks the *gerund* (but not the *gerundive*), the active perfect infinitive, the future infinitives, the passive present infinitive and the active future participle. From a *morphological* standpoint also the similarity is close. The modal system is the same except the perfect subjunctive (which in Latin is an Indo-European optative, while in Oscan-Umbrian it is a real subjunctive) and a few forms of the imperative. In tense-formation the *l*, *nki*, *f*- and *t*-perfects, a future which is morphologically equivalent to the Greek sigmatic future, *i.e.* the subjunctive of an original sigmatic aorist, the periphrastic future perfect based on the union of an active perfect participle with the subjunctive of the substantive verb, and the lack of the perfects in *vi* and the sigmatic aorist perfects (like *dixi*) are characteristic of the Oscan-Umbrian. Finally we find an almost complete agreement of the two systems in the *syntactical* employment of verb-forms. Buck has devoted pp. 137-150 to this interesting comparison.

The remaining thirty-seven pages are chiefly taken up with those 'contributions on points connected with the verbal system in Oscan and Umbrian' to which the author at first intended to confine himself. Among them are noteworthy his discussion of *seste* (p. 151) against Brugmann and Bréal, of the relation of *i* to *ii* (p. 158) against Bronisch, of Oscan *stait*, *stahint* (p. 160), the plausible explanation of the *p* in *hipid* and *hipust* as the result of a contamination of *habeo* and *capio* (p. 165), the conjecture to fill the lacuna in Zvetaieff Osc. 4 = v. Planta 204 *patt* [*rafens*] (p. 174), the treatment of passive (pp. 177-182), and finally the attempt to establish an active perfect participle for the Oscan-Umbrian, a somewhat bold hypothesis which is offered tentatively only.

The presentation throughout is clear and concise and much more *übersichtlich* than that of Buck's *Vocalismus*; the judgment is calm and sound. The treatise forms a valuable addition to Italic dialectology and is indispensable alike to the Latinist and the student of comparative Indo-European Philology.

HANNS OERTEL.

Yale University.
New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.

¹ See Meringer, *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* xxxix. (1888), p. 131 sq.

COOPER'S WORD-FORMATION IN THE ROMAN SERMO PLEBEIUS.

Word-Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius, by FREDERIC TABER COOPER, A.B., A.M., LL.B. Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia College. New York, Ginn & Co. 1895.

THIS is a bulky volume of between three and four hundred pages. On first seeing a thesis of such length, one naturally feels doubtful whether the quality can be equal to the quantity; but a thorough examination of the thesis in question shows it to be a careful piece of work and an important contribution to the study of the subject. The German authorities in particular have been freely used; but the work is by no means a mere compilation. It is no slight merit to have brought together in clear and concise form the results of essays and articles which lie scattered through a great body of literature and many of which are almost inaccessible to the average scholar; and this merit the thesis possesses in an eminent degree.

The brief preface is followed by a list of the principal authorities consulted. This list comprises about ninety works, and shows few important omissions. One is surprised however to find that the great *Corpus Glossariorum* of Loewe and Goetz, which is a veritable treasure-house of plebeian Latin, is not included. Loewe's 'Prodromus' to the *Corpus*, which might have supplied some useful hints, is also missing. Reference should certainly have been made to Saalfeld's *Tensaurus Italograecus* and Weise's *Griechische Wörter im Latein* which are extremely important for words derived from the Greek. The list contains almost no titles of works on Latin inscriptions; but this is due to the fact that the author has intentionally neglected the inscriptional material. The lexicographical works of Mr. Nettleship do not appear in the list; and in general the German authorities have been more completely brought under survey than the English.

Next in order comes an 'introduction' of about fifty pages, which discusses the nature and characteristics of the *sermo plebeius*. This introduction is conspicuous for its sound common-sense. It has been the fashion of late to deny the existence of the vulgar Latin in the sense of a dialect

distinct from the classic tongue. But nothing is more certain than that such a dialect existed. The language of our rural districts is scarcely more different from that of Addison or Hume than the speech of the Campanian peasants in Petronius from that of Cicero or Livy. On the other hand, too much emphasis has undoubtedly been laid upon the distinction between the two dialects, and the almost infinite shades and gradations that lie between them have been too much ignored. The truth, as usual, lies between the two extremes. In attempting a definition of the *sermo plebeius*—no easy task—Cooper holds, with Miodonski and others, that 'it is neither the parent nor the offspring of the Classic Latin, but that the two developed side by side, as the twin product of the common speech of early Rome.' The two rapidly diverged, the one retaining with surprising tenacity many of the features of the *prisca Latinitas*; while the other became more and more artificial. 'As time steadily widened the breach between these two forms of speech, communication between the upper and lower classes was facilitated by a compromise in the shape of the *sermo cotidianus*, the free and easy medium of daily conversation.' We have thus a triple division, the literary language, the speech of the lower classes, and the *sermo cotidianus*. Cooper next discusses the development of the *sermo plebeius* in the provinces, laying especial stress upon the influence of the military idiom and the conservation of archaism in provincial districts. There follow some interesting observations on word-formation in the Classical Latin. The author then proceeds to enumerate the literary sources of the plebeian vocabulary. These are, in the main, the writers whose style is usually admitted to have been more or less coloured by the *sermo plebeius*. It is noticeable however that, in spite of Sittl's contrary opinion, Cooper agrees with Stolz, Miodonski and others in regarding Vitruvius as distinctly 'vulgar,' a view with which most students of that author will probably agree. Apuleius, on the other hand, is regarded as less distinctly plebeian. The vocabulary of the early ecclesiastical writers has been carefully examined by the author, and the results included in his word-lists. Cooper next gives a summary of the main characteristics of the plebeian vocabulary, which however is too long to quote at

length. Particularly interesting are his lists of the peculiarities of word-formation that are characteristic of African Latin (p. xlvi.), and of the *sermo rusticus* (p. xlvii.).

The body of the work is divided into two parts under the headings 'Derivation' and 'Composition.' Under 'Derivation' are treated in order substantives, adjectives, diminutives, adverbs and verbs. Under 'Composition' are discussed prepositional compounds, nominal composition, and hybrids. Under the different terminations are given lists of words wholly or mainly confined to the plebeian Latin. These lists are one of the most important and valuable features of the book, and will certainly be of signal service to lexicographers. They are based in part upon lists previously published by Carl von Paucker and others, but the author has made extensive additions. He does not claim that they are absolutely complete, but they are certainly fuller than any that have hitherto appeared; and though I have noted some omissions these

are by no means numerous. Each word is placed under the name of the writer in whose works it first appears, and in the notes at the foot of the page is added as complete a list as possible of the authors who subsequently used it. Thus it is easy to trace a given word through the history of its usage.

Where so much has been well done, it is invidious to point out defects. I will however remark that the most unsatisfactory part of the book is that which treats of hybrids and words derived from the Greek. This part might have been made much more complete had the author consulted the works of Saalfeld and Weise mentioned above.

The book is however a valuable and important one; and it is much to be hoped that the author will publish the companion volume on Plebeian Syntax of which he speaks in his preface.

H. W. HAYLEY.

Harvard University.

CAUER ON THE GROUNDWORK OF HOMERIC CRITICISM.

Grundfragen der Homerkritik. Von PAUL CAUER. Hirzel: Leipzig. 1895. Pp. 322. Hirzel. 6 Mk.

DR. CAUER is to be congratulated on a book which is large and tolerant in purview and luminous and learned in composition. Though he has no theory of startling novelty to propound, he is a skilful exponent of views which he has made his own by force of a judicial mind and liberal sympathy. His critical sobriety well suits him for his task of impartially reviewing results which have been gained by inquirers in the many fields of the Homeric demesne, and drawing from them conclusions which are always interesting, even when one cannot agree with them. In all these respects his book is welcome, and does credit to the manners and literary style of German philological controversy.

It is impossible to follow Dr. Cauer through the whole range of subjects with which he deals. I must be content to give a list of his chapters. Book I., on 'Textkritik und Sprachwissenschaft,' has four chapters: Aristarchos, Præ-Alexandrian Text, 'Die Erste Niederschrift,' Mixture of Dialects. Book II, is entitled 'Analyse des

Inhalts,' and its chapters are: (1) the Historical Background; (2) Stages of Culture; (3) the Gods; (4) Homeric Composition; (5) Iliad and Odyssey. They are all to be read with profit; and though there is much with which I do not agree, everything is worthy of careful consideration. If I take for special discussion the chapter on *Cultur-stufen*, it is because it contains a courteous challenge to myself personally, with which I am glad to have this opportunity of dealing.

The general attitude which Cauer adopts in discussing the relation of the poems to early Greek culture as we are beginning to know it is one with which it is impossible to quarrel. The groundwork of the Epos is Mycenaean, in the arrangement of the house, in the prevalence of copper, and, as Reichel has shown, in armour. Yet in many points the poems are certainly later than the prime at least of the Mycenaean age. How is this to be explained? Is it that the poets are deliberately trying to present the conditions of an age anterior to their own? Or are they depicting the circumstances by which they are surrounded—circumstances which slowly change during the period of the development of the Epos?

Cauer decides for the latter alternative, the only one which is really conceivable in an age whose views are in many ways so naive as the poems themselves prove them to have been. Or rather we must recognize everywhere a compromise between two opposing principles; the singer on the one hand has to be conservatively tenacious of the old material which serves as the substance of his song, on the other hand he has to be vivid and actual in the contributions which he himself makes to the common stock.

Is it then possible to trace in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* the marks of this gradual development? Cauer makes the attempt in three important directions, and arrives at an affirmative result. I can deal at length only with his treatment of the use of iron, starting from Professor Jevons' paper in a recent number of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*. Mr. Jevons' conclusions were purely negative; assuming my own analysis of the *Iliad* as correct, he showed that there were no positive signs of development between the strata which I call I. and II. on the one hand, and III. to V. on the other. No doubt, as Cauer says, he might have brought out more clearly the fact that my theory is only one among many, and must not be taken as an admitted certainty. But, even so, a somewhat closer analysis on Mr. Jevons' part might have led to a more definite conclusion, which I will endeavour to draw.

In the *Menis*, as I have analysed it, iron is twice mentioned. The first passage is A 133. This recurs exactly in Z 46 ff. It obviously must have been borrowed in one place from the other, but I do not see that there is any particular reason for saying which is the original, unless the mention of iron itself be permitted to decide the question. To avoid a circular argument, however, we can only say that this case is doubtful, and that the chances appear to be equal. The other case is in X 357. This is one of the purely metaphorical uses (*σιδῆρεος ἐν φρεσὶ θυμός*) which admittedly do not prove more than a knowledge on the poet's part that there existed a substance of remarkable hardness called *σίδηρος*.

In the next place, it is hardly right to treat the whole of my stratum II. as if it were homogeneous. I have myself divided it into three stages; and it is at all events possible—I now think it almost certain—that later parts of it may be contemporaneous with parts of later strata. Dividing up among the divisions of II. the various occurrences of iron, we find the result to be

as follows: II. A, 4: II. B, 1: II. C, 3. In Stratum III. we have 8, in IV., 5. Now the difficulty in the way of a gradual development here is to be found only in the four occurrences of iron in II. A. These occur in two pairs; one pair is the double allusion to the iron mace of Areithoos (H 141, 144): the other two are in almost equally close neighbourhood, in Δ 485, 510. Thus the argument which Cauer directs against my theory really touches only these two passages. With regard to the end of Δ, the introduction to the aristeia of Diomedes in E, there can be no certainty that it is not a later editorial passage intended to fit E into the general structure of the *Iliad*: the question of the mace of Areithoos depends on the relative position which we assign to the two duels in iii. and vii. Cauer himself has given reasons for holding the duel in the third book to be the earlier; if he is right, and I feel it to be very possible that he is, then we have a steady progression in the mention of iron from the earlier stages of the *Iliad* to the later. And taking my three strata in order without any subdivision, we find the following progress: I. 2?: II. 8: III. 8: IV. 5. As the three strata contain approximately equal numbers of lines, the numerical test is fair, and, without leading to any positive result, is on the whole certainly not opposed to the accuracy of my division, assuming the iron test to be a valid one.

But this assumption is one which seems to me extremely rash, in consideration of the very few cases in which iron is mentioned. The difficulty is still greater in dealing with another test which Cauer applies—the mention of temples. He is of course right when he says that the poems contain clear traces of the older custom of worshipping the gods in the open air, especially among or under trees; and that houses for them are a latter innovation. The only two actual temples named in the *Iliad*, as he says, are those of Apollo and Athene in Troy, leaving out of sight the Erechtheum in Athens, which is generally recognized as an Attic interpolation (B 547). But it is not legitimate to draw from this the conclusion that the whole of books E—H, in which alone these two temples occur, belongs to the latest portions of the *Iliad*. Even assuming that temples were unknown in the earlier period of the Epos, which in itself is by no means certain, Cauer's analysis can at most prove that certain passages of E—H are late; he has no right to regard

these books, any more than any other part of the *Iliad*, as a contemporaneous unity.

And thus we are led back to the conclusion that *Culturstufen* can only be a very unsafe guide to unravelling the structure of the *Iliad*. At best they will serve, when used with great caution, as a test for individual passages. It is only when considered in the broadest way that the digamma itself can be shown to have gradually died out during the Epic period: yet we can test the presence of the digamma in thousands of passages, while questions of culture arise at most in a few score. And

even in these few score the ground is not safe beneath our feet: even since Cauer's book has appeared, the inference which he draws from the mention of writing in Z has been immensely weakened by Mr. Arthur Evans' recently published discoveries in Crete. While thanking Dr. Cauer therefore for the spirit of fairness and the suggestiveness with which he writes, I cannot feel that his discussion of culture has done much to advance the question.

WALTER LEAF.

WATTENBACH'S ANLEITUNG ZUR GRIECHISCHEN PALAEOGRAPHIE.

Anleitung zur griechischen Palaeographie, von W. WATTENBACH. Dritte Auflage. Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1895. 3 M. 60.

THE first edition of Wattenbach's well-known *Introduction to Greek Palaeography* appeared in 1867, the second in 1877. The last eighteen years have, however, seen the material and the literature of palaeography increased in so many directions, that a new edition has naturally been called for. It differs from its predecessors, not only in contents, but in arrangement. The auto-graphed description of the palaeographical history of each letter now appears in print,—a great gain in clearness, especially to the English reader,—and is followed by a useful section on the abbreviation-marks common in late Greek manuscripts. The lithographed facsimiles of MSS. which accompanied the former editions disappear, being unsatisfactory in themselves, and no longer necessary now that good photographic reproductions are easily accessible; and with them go also the descriptions of them. Finally, the form of the volume is changed from a quarto to a more convenient octavo. In its new shape, and with its considerably altered contents, the work seems to call for a few words of notice.

The most obvious criticism to pass upon Prof. Wattenbach's work is that it is not so much an introduction to Greek palaeography as to the literature of Greek palaeography. Not only the section on 'Geschichte und Litteratur der griechischen Palaeographie,' but also that which is entitled 'Die Hauptgattungen griechischer Schrift,' tells the reader far less about the

history of Greek writing than about the works in which he may find that history. The principal manuscripts of each century are mentioned, but in place of any full description of them we have a list of the editions and facsimiles in which they are reproduced. For the English student, at least, this is a great advantage. Instead of going over the ground already adequately occupied by Sir E. Maunde Thompson's recent *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography* (here described as 'die bedeutendste Erscheinung' and 'ein Meisterwerk, mit vollster Kenntniss des Gegenstandes und aller neuesten Entdeckungen geschrieben'), Prof. Wattenbach supplements it by the fullest bibliography of the subject to be found anywhere. This is the most valuable part of the book, supplying as it does not merely a very complete list of publications, but also a brief description of the character of the most important of them. On the other hand, the section dealing with palaeography itself ('Die wesentlichsten Veränderungen der griechischen Buchstaben') is rendered far less useful than it would otherwise have been by the absence of any indication, in very many cases, of the dates at which the successive forms of each letter are to be found. A table with dated columns, such as those given by Gardthausen and Thompson, would be infinitely more useful than these descriptions. Moreover, several of the commonest and most notable forms found in the papyri are omitted; e.g. the very characteristic forms of η and σ in the Roman period, and of μ and ν in the Ptolemaic. The tables of abbreviations, however, which follow, will be found useful.

H H

In the multitude of details which are compressed into this manual, a few inaccuracies or omissions may be noted. The editorship of the Palaeographical Society is incorrectly stated on p. 6: Mr. E. A. Bond, we are glad to say, is not dead, and the editorship of the Society's publications was shared at first by Mr. Bond and Mr. (now Sir) E. M. Thompson, and subsequently by Mr. Thompson and Mr. Warner. The facsimile of the Gospel of Peter published by M. Lods (*Mémoires... de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire*, ix. 3, 1893) might be mentioned on p. 8, as well as that by von Gebhardt. Lods' facsimile, moreover, includes the Book of Enoch from the same Gizeh MS. The British Museum Odyssey papyrus (p. 14) belongs to the first half of the first century (not far from A.D. 1), not the second. The complete facsimile of the Herodas papyrus is omitted (*ib.*). There is no reason to suppose that the papyrus MS. of the Funeral Oration of Hyperides was found in the same tomb as that of the speeches against Demosthenes and for Lycophron and Euxenippus; and consequently Prof. Wattenbach's argument as to the date of the latter falls to the ground (pp. 14, 15). A complete facsimile of the Paris Hyperides MS. (which it is rather misleading to describe as simply 'ein Fragment,' seeing that the greater part of the speech is preserved) has been published by M. Revillout (1893). Schoene's attribution of the Isocrates papyrus at Marseilles to the Ptolemaic period is impossible (p. 16); it is probably of the fourth or fifth century. The papyrus of the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, described as 'schwerlich jünger als das zweite Jahrhundert' (p. 17), would be more accurately dated if 'first' were substituted for 'second'; the immense increase of material for the palaeography of the first two centuries makes it certain that this MS. must have been written about A.D. 100. With reference to the Herculanean papyri (p. 21) it might be mentioned that photographs of all the otherwise unpublished Oxford facsimiles have been issued

by the Oxford Philological Society in several volumes (1889 etc.) The attribution of all the great uncial MSS. of the Bible (Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Sarravianus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi, p. 27-31) to Egyptian scribes, though possible, must be taken as doubtful, owing to our want of knowledge concerning the contemporary styles of writing in other countries. The facsimile of the Codex Marchalianus, published by Ceriani, should be added to the list of sixth century MSS. on pp. 33-35, where the Codd. Bezae and Claromontanus are (presumably by an oversight) apparently assigned to the seventh century. In connection with the Uspensky Psalter (the oldest dated uncial MS.), mentioned on p. 39, reference may now be made to a note by F. Ruhl in the last number of the *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (vol. iv. p. 588), in which it is shown that there is some reason to suppose that the date in the MS. is stated according to the Alexandrian world-era, instead of the Constantinopolitan, which would have the effect of transferring it from A.D. 862 to 877/8. In the list of facsimiles of cursive papyri on pp. 45, 46, reference might be made (in addition to Wilcken's *Schrifttafeln*) to the atlases accompanying the Paris *Notices et Extraits*, the British Museum Catalogue, and the Flinders Petrie Papyri. Finally, it is not accurate to say (p. 118) that the division of words at the end of a line is quite irregular in Egyptian MSS. There are, no doubt, exceptions; but the rule unquestionably is that the break is made after a vowel, except in the case of double consonants, where it *may* be made between them. Even in non-literary papyri this rule is generally observed, and in literary MS. it is almost invariable.

The above corrections and additions are offered simply as a contribution towards making still more complete and accurate a most useful volume, for which students of palaeography are deeply indebted to Prof. Wattenbach.

F. G. KENYON.

WACHSMUTH'S INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF ANCIENT HISTORY.

Einführung in das Studium der alten Geschichte von CURT WACHSMUTH. Leipzig: Hirzel. Pp. vi. + 718.

THE name of Professor Wachsmuth relieves the reviewer from the necessity of criti-

cizing this book at length: it is, of itself, adequate proof of excellence. The book is a sketch of the chief authorities for ancient history and the chief writers on it. An introduction of sixty-six pages surveys the treatment of ancient history by the

moderns: the bulk of the volume is divided into, first, a consideration of the general sources of ancient history, the writers of universal history or biography, Diodorus, Orosius, Plutarch; and, secondly, a consideration of the special sources for the histories of special countries and nations. Detailed examination of such contents is impossible, and I can only say that, so far as I can

judge, the volume is eminently distinguished by learning and ability in the selection alike of facts and of theories: for the rest I can safely leave Professor Wachsmuth's name to speak. The volume may fairly claim attentive study from every student of ancient history: it is probably one of the best books written on this subject.

F. HAVERFIELD.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES IN ROME.

It is excellent news that an American School of Classical Studies has been started in Rome with Professor Gardner Hale as its first Director (for 1895-6), and Professor Frothingham as Associate Director. The object of the School 'is to promote the study of such subjects as (1) Latin Literature, as bearing upon customs and institutions; (2) inscriptions in Latin and in the Italic dialects; (3) Latin palaeography; (4) the topography and antiquities of Rome itself; and (5) the archaeology of ancient Italy (Italic, Etruscan, Roman), and of the Early Christian, Mediaeval and Renaissance periods. It will furnish regular instruction and guidance in several or all of these fields, will encourage original research and exploration, and will co-operate with the Archaeological Institute of America, with which it is affiliated.' Professor Warren is to be the Director in its second year (1896-7), and provision has been made for carrying on the School through a third year. The success of the American School at Athens, formed on the same lines and with similar objects, leaves no room for doubt that the School at Rome will flourish for many more than three years. One cannot help hoping that so good a lead will be followed by English scholars, and that an attempt will be made to organize and direct in the same way English study and research in Archaeology at Rome, which have hitherto been carried on with comparatively little assistance and encouragement.

G. E. MARINDIN.

THE SECOND DELPHIAN HYMN.

Un nouvel hymne à Apollon: H. WEIL and TH. REINACH. *Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique* xviii.

THOSE who have interested themselves in the remains of ancient Greek music discovered by the French excavations at Delphi will remember that besides the two blocks of marble containing the now famous Hymn some smaller fragments were found, which apparently formed part of a similar composition. On these fragments however the musical characters belonged to a different system of notation,—the system, namely, which, according to our authorities, was used for instrumental music; whereas the music of the Hymn to Apollo is written in the vocal notation. The excitement caused by this remarkable discovery had hardly subsided when it became known that another Hymn to Apollo had come to light. This new Hymn is now published in the *Bulletin* of the French School of Athens. It was found, like the former one, in the Treasury of the Athenians at Delphi, and proves to be the work to which the smaller fragments belonged. The ingenuity and patience of M. Homolle and his associates has now restored these fragments to their several places in the original composition. The result of this labour, again, has been submitted to the editors of the former Hymn, MM. H. Weil and Th. Reinach, who have now printed their transcription of the hymn with a conjectural restoration, both of text and of music, wherever the state of the materials made it at all possible. This work, it is needless to add, has been

performed with the same care and scholarly judgment as before.

Our first glance at the new hymn raises the highest expectations. It is considerably longer than the other, and exhibits greater variety of style and treatment. Unhappily it is not nearly so well preserved. In the former case we possess a block of marble—one of the two fragments of the inscription—which contains some sixty bars of music, and of these not more than twelve are at all defective. But in the piece before us we nowhere find more than four consecutive bars of which all the notes can be read. Generally speaking, two bars out of every five are hopelessly mutilated. The only set-off against this provoking state of things is that the new hymn is a work of the same class, perhaps of the same period, as the former one. Each therefore throws considerable light on the other. In particular the important rule by which the rise and fall of the melody is made to correspond to the grammatical accents is observed with equal strictness in both hymns. The practice of doubling the vowel or diphthong when a syllable has more than one note is also followed in both. Another common feature is the absence of any indication of the rhythm, which must therefore be taken to be sufficiently marked by the quantity of the successive syllables.

The new hymn is divided, by marks of separation or metrical indications, into at least seven sections. The first six of these are in the cretic or paeonic metre (5-time), which is also the metre of the former hymn. The last section is in a glyconic metre. These sections correspond to the divisions of the subject. First (*A*) there is an invocation of the Muses. Then (*B*) all nature is pictured as rejoicing, while (*C*) Apollo passes from Delos to Athens, and there is invoked as Paeon, 'the healer.' Then (*D*) the poet describes his progress to Parnassus, (*E*) his laying the foundations of his temple at Delphi, his meeting the dragon, which (*F*) he slew, and the deliverance of Delphi from the invading Gauls. Finally (*G*) the rhythm changes from cretic to glyconic, and the poem ends with a prayer to Apollo, Artemis and Leto, imploring them to protect Athens and Delphi, and to grant victory to the Romans.

In the former hymn, it will be remembered, we had examples of change of genus, from Diatonic to Chromatic and conversely, and also of the modulation (as we may term it) involved in the occasional use of the 'conjunct' tetrachord (*τετραχορ-*

δον συνημμένων). The new hymn presents us with analogous changes, by means of which the transition from one section to another is usually marked by a difference in the character of the music. The mutilated condition of the marble makes it difficult to determine the exact scale employed in each case: but under M. Reinach's guidance we may offer the following account.

The first section (*A*) is noted in the Lydian key (answering to our scale with one flat), and employs the notes *A B♭ D E♭ E♮ F G*. Of these *D* is the Mesè, and we have accordingly to recognize (1) the tetrachord *mesôn*, *A—D*, but with the Lichanos *C* omitted, (2) the tetrachord *diezeugmenôn*, *E—A*, with Nêtè omitted, and finally (3) the tetrachord *synêmmenôn*, *D E♭ F G*. The concluding section (*G*) is also Lydian, the scale being that of section *A*, with the addition of a tone below. This additional note, which is not important in the melody, should perhaps be regarded as a Hyperhypatè. These two sections are purely Diatonic, and seem to represent the primary key of the composition.

With section *B* the key becomes the Hypolydian, and this is also the key of section *C*, except in the middle part of the three into which it is subdivided, and also of section *D* and part at least of section *F*. The scale employed extends over an Octave and a Fourth, viz. from Hypatè *mesôn* (*E*) to Nêtè *hyperbolaiôn* (the higher *A*): but this last note only occurs once, and the Lichanos *hyperbolaiôn* (*G*) not at all. In these parts of the poem the genus is still the Diatonic. The close of the melody is on *E*.

The middle part of section *C*, which we may call *Cb*, returns to the Lydian key, and employs the scale *A B♭ B♮ D E♭ E♮ G*. The four lower notes are those of the Chromatic tetrachord *mesôn*. The last four might be thought to be the corresponding Chromatic tetrachord *synêmmenôn*; but M. Reinach is doubtless right in deciding against this view. The symbol which we here transcribe by *E♮* is not the one which stands (in the Lydian key) for the Chromatic Paranêtè *synêmmenôn* (>), but denotes the Paramecè (*E*). Moreover the notes *E♭* and *E♮* do not occur together, or even in the same musical phrase. We must therefore explain them as we did in section *A*, viz. by change from the disjunct to the conjunct System, i.e. by modulation. M. Reinach justly compares the octave scales given by Ptolemy (*Harm.* ii. 16), from

which it appears that the Chromatic varieties, and indeed all departures from the normal Diatonic, were regularly employed in only one of the two tetrachords of the scale. Indeed the scale now in question is closely akin to that which Ptolemy describes under the name *τρόπος* or *τροπικά*. An even nearer approach may be found in section E, which exhibits the same scale as Cb, except that the upper G is wanting, and a G is added at the lower end. It is remarkable that this G, unlike the similar note in section G, forms the close of the melody.

The part which we have called F—the last in cretic measure—is so mutilated that it cannot be analysed with any approach to certainty. Probably it was divided into at least two sections; for the notation in the earlier part of it is Hypo-lydian, in the latter part Lydian.

In conformity with the accepted doctrine M. Reinach has to assume that each passage in the composition now before us is written, not only in a particular key—as to which there is no controversy—but also in one of seven *modes* (Dorian, Phrygian, Lydian, &c.), i.e. in an octave scale distinguished by a particular succession of intervals. The present reviewer, believing that in classical Greek music the terms Dorian and the like refer only to the key, would avoid those terms at this part of the inquiry, and only ask what scale or 'system' is employed, and which notes can be shown to hold the place of key-note and final note respectively in the melody. It may be worth while to see whether this method of explanation carries us as far as that adopted by M. Reinach. The former hymn, it will be remembered, was in the Dorian mode. The short fragments published along with it were conjecturally assigned by M. Reinach to the Hypo-lydian mode: but this view is no longer tenable. He now regards the two sections A and G as in all probability Dorian. The other Diatonic portions, B, Ca, Cc, and D, might also, he admits, be referred to the same mode, especially as in all of them the key is the Hypo-lydian (without flats or sharps) and the melody ends on E. But on this view the Mesê would be A, and (curiously enough) that note only occurs once in these sections. He therefore decides for the Mixolydian mode (B—B, with E as Mesê). With regard to the Chromatic passages (sections Cb and E), M. Reinach pronounces the question of mode to be otiose, the composer probably not having put it to himself. If it is to be put, M. Reinach would assign Cb to the Mixo-

lydian (A to A, with B \flat and E \flat), and E either to the same mode, or to the Hypodorian (G to G with the same two flats). The remark that the composer probably had no particular mode in view seems a just one, and perhaps its application may be extended. But, accepting the results arrived at by M. Reinach, let us see how they would be expressed in terms of a theory which does not speak of modes under the names which denote the keys. Greek theory recognizes, in the so-called Perfect System, an octave of two disjunct tetrachords E—A B—E, which may be combined with the conjunct tetrachord AB \flat CD. Thus there is an E-octave without accidentals, and an E-octave with B \flat , equivalent as regards succession of intervals to a B \flat octave. The former, in the accepted theory, is Dorian, the latter Mixolydian. But if A, the Mesê, is the key-note, the former has the tonality of a key of A, so far agreeing with the Hypo-dorian of the accepted theory: and the latter similarly becomes Dorian. Thus then we find that M. Reinach's three modes—Dorian, Hypo-dorian and Mixolydian (or Hyper-dorian)—are precisely those which are accounted for by the ancient Perfect System, with its alternation of 'disjunct' and 'conjunct.' These in short are the scales which can be analysed into tetrachords of the form semitone + tone + tone (in ascending order)—the only form which Greek theory admits.

These considerations are not put forward as though they were decisive against the theory of the seven Modes. It may be said that Dorian and kindred modes were appropriate to the worship of Apollo. All that is contended is that the Delphian hymns do not support that theory.

In this connexion it will be useful to refer to the fresh examination of the remains of Greek music contained in M. Gevaert's new book, *La Mélodie antique dans le Chant de l'Église latine*. M. Gevaert, who was especially concerned to determine the scale and tonality of every melody or fragment of a melody that has been preserved, found examples of the Dorian, Hypo-dorian, Hypo-phrygian and Hypo-lydian modes. To the Dorian he assigned the fragment of the *Orestes* of Euripides (thus confirming the view which I ventured to put forward in opposition to Dr. Crusius and M. Ruelle), the first Hymn to Apollo, and the then known fragments of the second Hymn, as well as the later hymns to Helios and Calliope. The Hypo-dorian mode is seen by him in three short

instrumental pieces, and also in the music of the first Pythian ode as given by Kircher, which he is inclined to accept as genuine. The Hypo-phrygian or Ionian mode is exemplified by the Seikilos inscription, and the hymn to Nemesis attributed to Mesomedes. The Hypo-lydian is found only in one of the short instrumental pieces of the *Anonymus*. Thus the earliest known non-Dorian music would be of the first or second century A.D. Till that time it seems that we may apply to Greek musicians generally what Aristophanes says of Cleon in his boyhood—

τὴν Δωριστὶ μὲν ἵναρ-
μόττεσθαι θαυὰ τὴν λύραν,
ἄλλην δ' οὐκ ἐθέλειν λαβεῖν.

M. Reinach concludes his paper by some interesting observations on the style and aesthetic character of the second Hymn to Apollo. He notices in the first and last sections a striking feature, characteristic also of the former Hymn, which consists in the omission of the Lichanos (*C*) in the tetrachord *mesôn*. The remark may be applied also to the tetrachord *diezeugmenôn*; for the high *G* is only found in connexion with *E*, and is therefore to be regarded as *Nêtê synêmmenôn* (*DEFG*), not *Tritê diezeugmenôn* (*EFGA*). This peculiarity is said to have distinguished the Dorian music of the ancient flute-player Olympus. M. Reinach is probably right in considering it as an instance of the tendency to archaism in art which was characteristic of the period. In respect of aesthetic character and treatment, he pronounces the new hymn less meritorious than the other. The composer has sought for effect by means of frequent changes of key, of genus, of mode. But in the separate passages the melody is poor and monotonous. The most interesting feature is the use made of the Chromatic genus, which fully answers to the accounts of it given by the theoretical writers. The date is not fixed except by the mention of the Romans, which points to some time after the middle of the second century B.C.

The paper also contains some further observations, by M. Weil as well as M. Reinach, on the first Hymn, with a new transcription of it. The rule of the accents has proved useful in guiding the restoration both of the text and the musical notes. Thus the word *δικορίνια* in the former transcription, which violated the rule, has been changed into *δικόρυνβα*, which

observes it. Again the second syllable of *θναρός* was at first given with the notes *D♯F*, with a rising pitch; but we now read the high *A♯* for *D♯* (*Α* for *Δ*), and thus obtain the fall of pitch which belongs to the circumflex. The chief improvement however is the inversion in the order of the two blocks of marble. By this change the invocation of the Muses comes, as it should, at the beginning, and the traditional topics, such as the combat with the dragon and the deliverance from the Gauls, take similar places in the two poems.

It may be mentioned in conclusion that M. Gevaert promises a discussion of this Hymn by way of supplement to his new book.

D. B. MONRO.

P.S.—I may take this opportunity of mentioning that the corrected rendering of the Seikilos inscription referred to by M. Reinach (p. 366), and M. Gevaert (*Melopée*, p. 386), has been printed as an appendix to my book, *The Modes of Ancient Greek Music* (Clarendon Press, 1894), and will be sent on application to any purchaser of that book.

NAVARRÉ ON THE GREEK THEATRE.

Dionysos : étude sur l'organisation matérielle du théâtre Athénien : par OCTAVE NAVARRÉ. Paris : Librairie C. Klincksieck. 1895. Pp. viii. 320.

UNDER the above title M. Navarre has written an interesting account of the theatre and theatrical performances of ancient Greece. His book makes no pretence to be exhaustive, but at the same time it contains everything that is of real interest or importance in connexion with the subject. It is written in a lively and vigorous style, and the arrangement is a model of lucidity. It was not to be expected that, on a question which has been so thoroughly discussed in recent years as that of the Greek theatre, an author should be able to produce much that is original. M. Navarre, however, though he has no startling theories to announce, is far from being a mere compiler from the works of others. He has evidently studied the original sources of information with conscientious care, and decided each difficulty for himself. His clearness of judgment, and his capacity for weighing evidence, give exceptional value to

his conclusions. Hence his book, though covering the old ground, has a distinct and independent value of its own; and will serve as an admirable guide to those who wish to make themselves acquainted with the salient features of the ancient theatre, without bewildering their minds with excessive detail or fanciful hypothesis. The work is brought well up to date, the results of the latest discoveries and excavations being clearly explained. It is also enriched with well-chosen illustrations and valuable appendices. Perhaps, however, it might have been made handier for reference by the addition of a more copious index.

The part of the book to which one naturally turns with most curiosity is that which deals with the vexed question of the stage. On this subject M. Navarre has no doubts. He comes to the conclusion that the new theory of Dr. Dörpfeld cannot be maintained, in face of the unanimous testimony of ancient writers. He also points out very clearly a fact which is often overlooked, that this same testimony of the ancients has been confirmed, and not invalidated, by archaeological discoveries. Every Greek theatre which has been investigated in modern times tallies closely with the descriptions of Vitruvius. Under these circumstances it is impossible to contend that Vitruvius' account of the structure of the Greek theatre is not an accurate one. The supporters of the new theory admit this fact; but they suppose that Vitruvius, while describing correctly the outward appearance of the different parts of the theatre, was mistaken as to the purpose for which they were intended; that he imagined the proscenium was a stage, while in reality it was a background. This view, as M. Navarre shows, would have been more plausible, if the statement of Vitruvius concerning the object of the proscenium had been merely a casual observation. But seeing that it is deliberately introduced to account for the general arrangement of the Greek theatre, and that it is made the basis of the directions as to the relative position of proscenium and orchestra, its correctness can hardly be impugned.

The recent French excavations in the theatre at Delos, of which an account is given at the end of the volume, are in themselves almost sufficient to overthrow the Dörpfeldian theory; and their significance is well brought out by M. Navarre. From the long inscription relating to theatrical expenditure we learn, on indisputable

evidence, that the *λογεῖον* was identical with the *προσκήνιον*. Here then we have a definite proof of the existence of a stage in Greek theatres as early as the beginning of the third century B.C. Further than this, the remains of the building at Delos strikingly confirm all that is told us by the grammarians. On the top of the proscenium are three doors, leading into the stage-buildings at the back. This is just as it should be, according to Pollux and Vitruvius. On the other hand the only communication between the bottom of the proscenium and the orchestra is through a single door, three feet wide. If then, as Dr. Dörpfeld supposes, the proscenium was a background and not a stage, we should have to face this difficulty. We should have to suppose, in the first place, that Pollux and Vitruvius were mistaken in believing that there were three doors leading on to the Greek stage. In the second place, we should have to assume that the Greek architects were so foolish that they only supplied one narrow door for the exits and entrances of the actors and their attendants; while in order to mount on to the top of the background (which would rarely be necessary, except when a god appeared) they provided a choice of no less than three openings.

A hardly less cogent proof is afforded by the remains of the Eretrian theatre, where the floor of the stage-buildings is found to be on a level, not with the orchestra, but with the top of the proscenium. In order to enter the orchestra from the stage-buildings it is necessary to descend a staircase and traverse a vaulted passage. But is it conceivable that any architect, in designing a theatrical building, would have gone out of his way to supply such an inconvenient means of communication between the dressing-rooms of the actors and the place where they had to perform? Is it not evident that the top of the proscenium, being on the same level as the floor of the stage-buildings, must have been intended for the stage?

The chief objection to the received theory lies in the peculiar dimensions of the ancient proscenium, as described by Vitruvius and as still found in the existing theatres. A stage twelve feet high would have been too far removed from the level of the orchestra to admit of free conversation between chorus and actors; and a stage eight to ten feet deep would have been too narrow to allow of the occasional presence of the chorus. M. Navarre avoids this difficulty

by adopting my own view, that the stage of the fifth century was lower and wider than that of later times. He points out that we have no information as to the size of the early classical stage. All the stages which have been discovered belong to a subsequent period. The reason why they were raised and narrowed to the shape described by Vitruvius is to be found in the decline of the chorus, which in the course of the fourth century disappeared altogether from comedy, and ceased to take an active part even in tragedy. In these altered circumstances the Vitruvian stage would fulfil all the requirements of an ancient drama.

Another question of considerable interest is the date of the ancient stone theatre at Athens. Dr. Dörpfeld, it is well known, contends that during the great period of the drama the Athenians were contented with wooden theatres, and that the permanent stone building, of which the remains still survive, was not begun till the middle of the fourth century, and that it was completed soon afterwards by Lycurgus. M. Navarre, in this case, accepts his views without reserve, and declares that the question is practically settled. But it may be doubted whether he has not gone too far in making this admission. It is true that certain parts of the theatre—the stage-buildings and the row of marble thrones—are generally admitted to be of comparatively late date. But as far as the auditorium in general is concerned, the question is rather different, and many people still maintain that it belongs, at any rate in part, to the fifth century. No doubt the opinion of an expert like Dr. Dörpfeld, on a subject so peculiarly his own as the date of an ancient building, is difficult to resist. But at the same time the arguments by which he endeavours to prove the late date of the auditorium are by no means conclusive. He points to the fact that Aristophanes speaks of the seats in the theatre as *ἱκρία*, or 'wooden benches.' But as the earliest theatres were undoubtedly of wood, there is nothing improbable in the supposition that the old term *ἱκρία* was still retained, even after a stone erection had been substituted. He also refers to the statements concerning Lycurgus and his work in connexion with the theatre. Hyperides, in enumerating the services of Lycurgus to the state, declares that he 'built the theatre.' But this is clearly a rhetorical exaggeration, since the decree passed by the people in honour of Lycurgus only claims for him the merit of having

'completed' the theatre, which was previously 'half-finished.' In these expressions there is nothing inconsistent with the supposition that the auditorium had been begun in the fifth century, and that the whole structure was perfected by Lycurgus in the fourth by the addition of the stage-buildings and the marble thrones.

The arguments which Dr. Dörpfeld draws from the existing remains are equally indecisive. He points out that in certain parts of the auditorium conglomerate is used as a foundation; but conglomerate, he says, was never employed in any other building before the fourth century. If, however, the Athenian theatre was the *first* building in which conglomerate was adopted, what is there to prevent us from assuming that it was used as early as the fifth century? Further than this, he shows that one of the stones employed in the construction of the auditorium had previously served as an inscriptive monument, the date of the inscription being the latter part of the fifth century; and that another stone contains, as a workman's mark, the letter Ω—a symbol which was not introduced into Athens until 403 B.C. Both these stones, however, are found not very far from one another in the western wing of the auditorium; and, though they may be held to settle the date of that particular part of the building, they are no proof that the whole auditorium was posterior to the fifth century.

On the other hand there are certain considerations which seem to militate against Dr. Dörpfeld's opinion. In the first place there is the definite statement of Suidas that the stone theatre was commenced in 499 B.C., owing to the collapse of the benches in the old wooden erection. This piece of information is not of a kind which is likely to have been invented, since it is merely a dry fact without any special interest. Again, we know that many cities in Greece—such as Epidaurus, the Piræus, and Megalopolis—already possessed stone theatres considerably before the middle of the fourth century. If, therefore, Dr. Dörpfeld's theory is correct, we must suppose that Athens, the original home of the drama, and the city most distinguished in Greece for the grandeur of its public buildings, was one of the latest communities to provide itself with a solid and permanent theatre. The supposition is so improbable that it is hard to acquiesce in the date which Dr. Dörpfeld has assigned, and it seems safer to suspend one's judgment on this question of the chronology of the

Athenian theatre until more decisive evidence has been brought forward.

A. E. HAIGH.

FOUCART ON THE ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES.

Recherches sur l'Origine et la Nature des Mystères d'Éleusis; M. P. FOUCART. Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Pp. 84. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale. 1895. 3 fr. 50.

IN attributing the origin of the Eleusinian mysteries to Egyptian sources, M. Foucart revives a theory more fashionable in the time of Herodotus than at the present day. The conclusions at which he arrives are, briefly, as follows. About the sixteenth or seventeenth century B.C. colonists or fugitives from Egypt brought the cult of Isis and Osiris to Argos and Attica. The indigenous Pelasgi probably worshipped the Earth, among other natural objects, but only in a rude and impersonal way. The Pelasgic Earth-goddess was absorbed by Isis, who was not only a chthonic deity but also the giver of agriculture and civilization. As Osiris was closely associated with Isis, the oldest form of the Eleusinian cult included a god as well as a goddess; and in historic times this god, who was at first known by the simple title of *θεός*, continued to exist as Zeus Eubouleus, Pluto, and Dionysus. Originally the worship of the Eleusinian Demeter was merely a form of the general worship of Isis-Demeter or Demeter Thesmophoros, which was adopted by all the Hellenic tribes before the Dorian invasion. But, before the eleventh century, the goddess Kore had been abstracted from the primitive Demeter. Such was the development of the cult at Eleusis down to the seventh century, at which period the Greeks became better acquainted with Egypt, and borrowed the doctrine of a future life, as taught in the religion of Isis and Osiris. This idea of a happy state, reserved for the initiated after death, was not a natural outcome of the old worship of Demeter *Καρποφόρος* and *Θεσμοφόρος*, but was thus a later addition to the original debt.

M. Foucart argues his case with all the learning and all the lucidity that might be expected in the work of so distinguished a scholar and archaeologist. Yet, as far as

the early history of the Eleusinia is concerned, the theory, in spite of M. Foucart's brilliant advocacy, is not likely to win general approval, unless it is supported by more evidence than is at present forthcoming. To begin with, the theory is unnecessary; for no supposition of Egyptian influence is required to explain the presence of mysteries on Greek soil. This is not the place to quote savage analogies to the Eleusinia and Thesmophoria; it is sufficient to remind the reader that such mysteries are world-wide, and are the product, not of a high civilization like the Egyptian, but of a very primitive stage of society. The Eleusinia and Thesmophoria arose from agrarian ritual; and M. Foucart will hardly contend that agriculture in general was introduced into Greece by the Egyptians. He states, it is true, that wheat and barley were not indigenous in Greece, but were imported from the region of the Euphrates; but it may be pointed out that the Euphrates is not the Nile, and Demeter was something more than the mere giver of wheat and barley. But the theory (as far as we can at present judge) is not only unnecessary, but improbable. For it has yet to be proved that the Egyptians had any direct intercourse with the Greeks on the mainland from the seventeenth to the thirteenth century B.C.—the period mentioned by M. Foucart as the date of an Egyptian maritime supremacy in the islands of the Aegean. It is known that these islands were for some time subject to the Egyptians; but their empire was probably maintained through the agency of the Phoenicians. And with regard to Greece proper, there is no evidence of any relations between the early Greeks and the Egyptians except through the medium of Phoenician traders or colonists. This view is held by the most recent historians, e.g. Busolt (*Griech. Gesch.* i. pp. 84, 181 f.), Holm (i. ch. ix.), and Abbott (*History of Greece*, i. pp. 55-57). M. Foucart asks why we should reject the myth of Danaus, when we accept the myth of Cadmus as the embodiment of a historical fact. To this objection it may be replied that the myth of Cadmus would not be admitted as historical, if the Phoenician influence in Greece were not proved by further evidence of a conclusive character. But as such corroborative testimony is lacking in the case of the Egyptians, we are not justified in reading actual history into an isolated myth. Or, if we are determined to extract a historical kernel from the legend, we must be content to follow E.

Meyer (*Gesch. d. Alterth. i. § 264*), who sees in it a faded reminiscence of the Egyptian empire in the Greek islands during the fifteenth century.

Very probably the author is right in reckoning Egyptian influence as a force which exerted itself upon the *later* development of the Eleusinian mysteries. Whether this influence was direct or indirect is a point more difficult to decide. According to Lenormant and other scholars, certain elements of the mysteries were borrowed from Egypt, notably the conception of Dionysus-Zagreus; but these elements were transmitted through the medium of Orphism. M. Foucart, on the other hand, disbelieves in the theory that the reconstruction of the Eleusinia was due to the Orphic sect. The Orphic doctrines were similar to the Eleusinian because they were in both cases borrowed from Egyptian sources. Perhaps the most striking part of M. Foucart's argument is his explanation of the secret formulas (τὰ ἀπόρρητα) spoken by the hierophant (pp. 66-72). In these mysterious sayings he sees the Eleusinian counterpart of the Book of the Dead. The only difference was that while the Book of the Dead was buried with the mummy to guide the soul on its last journey, the formulas spoken at Eleusis were (he believes) learnt by heart, so that there was no need to commit them to writing. The Orphics, on the other hand, closely followed the Egyptian practice; M. Foucart quotes the interesting series of Orphic inscriptions, in Greek hexameters, from the tombs of Petelia, Thurii, and Eleutherna (Crete), in which the soul is directed on its way 'to the sacred meadows and groves of Persephone.'

E. E. SIKES.

WAS THE FLAMINICA DIALIS PRIESTESS OF JUNO?

THE statement has often been made that, as the Flamen Dialis was the priest of Jupiter, so his wife was the priestess of Juno. I do not know who was originally responsible for so natural an inference. I do not find it in Ambrosch, the surest-footed of the earlier writers on the Roman religious system. But the assertion was made by Preller, though not quite so definitely as by later writers; the Flaminica was 'eine priesterliche Dienerin der Juno.' (Jordan in his edition has added no comment, vol. i. p. 122.) Marquardt

(*Staatsverfassung*, ed. 2, p. 331) says plainly that she was 'Priesterin der Juno,' and here again Wissowa the excellent editor makes no remark. Roscher in his tract on Juno and Hera goes a trifle further: 'die Flaminica Dialis hatte den Opferdienst der Juno zu versehen.' Hence the statement has found its way into the same scholar's article on Juno in his *Mythological Lexicon*, and is repeated still more emphatically in the article on Jupiter in the same work (p. 700).

I do not suppose that I should have been led to test the value of these assertions, if they had not been recently used to support a much more important inference, and one of the utmost interest for the student of early Italian religious ideas. Preller allowed himself to write in passing that 'the Flamen and his wife appeared before the people as in some sense the living images of the deities of light whom they serve.' Roscher took the hint and, after his manner, carried it out to its logical consequences. He sees in the Flamen and his wife, and the rules of life which governed them, a means of getting at the ideas which lay at the root of the cult of Jupiter and Juno. The latter, in his view, are husband and wife, as well as gods presiding over marriage (*Myth. Lex. s.v. Juno*, p. 590; cp. *Juno and Hera*, p. 63). Or, as the author of the article on Jupiter puts it, 'die alterthümliche institution des flamen und der flaminica beweist auch, dass die paarweise Götterverehrung in Italien eine ursprüngliche war.'

This inference is to the explorer at first sight as water in a thirsty land. He knows that the cult is the only safe guide in the study of old Italian religion: he knows that the question—a vital one—whether the oldest Romans thought of any of their gods as married couples, cannot be decided by any literary evidence. But if it can be proved that the priest of Jupiter was the husband of the priestess of Juno, he feels at once that he has hold of something definite and trustworthy. The peculiar sanctity of the marriage tie in this case, together with the strange restrictions under which the pair were placed, and the undoubted antiquity of the priesthoods, taken in comparison with evidence from other races as to the relation of gods and priests, prepare him to accept the inference as one of great value. If the water should not turn out to be a mirage, we may fairly believe that Jupiter and Juno were really a married couple, and that the oldest

Italians had got at least as far as this on their way towards polytheism.

We know that the Flamen Dialis was attached to the cult of Jupiter: but what is the evidence that the Flaminica was priestess of Juno? All the writers I have quoted, and some others of less importance, cite but a single passage, and that from an author whose authority on such matters is not weighty and who in this particular instance expresses himself doubtfully. Plutarch in his 86th *Roman Question* speaks of the Flaminica as *ἱερὰν τῆς Ἥρας εἶναι δοκοῦσαν*. (Roscher would read *ἱεραία* on no manuscriptal evidence.¹) In this 86th *Question* Plutarch may have been drawing, directly or indirectly, on a gloss of Verrius Flaccus (cp. Festus s.v. *Maius mensis*): but there is nothing in Festus to bear out his remark about the Flaminica, and the word *δοκοῦσαν* shows pretty clearly that what he says of her is simply his own suggestion, which of itself is quite worthless. Apart from this passage I can find no ancient authority for the idea that the Flaminica was specially concerned with the cult of Juno. There may be such authority, but if the eminent scholars I have quoted can find nothing better than Plutarch's doubtful sentence, I am not likely to be able to do so. And indeed I find a good deal which points in a different direction.

In a Verrian gloss on *flammeum* I find the following: Paulus, p. 92, line 16: 'flammeo vestimento flaminica utebatur, id est Dialis uxor et Jovis sacerdos, cui telum fulminis eodem erat colore.' This definite statement, coming from a good authority, that the Flaminica was priestess of Jupiter, is borne out by a passage of Macrobius. On the *nundinae*, he says, quoting Granius Licinianus, she offered a ram to Jupiter in the Regia (*Sat.* i. 16. 30): on the other hand, on the Kalends of every month from March to December, which were specially sacred to Juno, it is not the Flaminica who sacrifices to Juno, but the *regina sacrorum*: cf. Ambrosch, *Studien und Andeutungen*, p. 13. And, so far as I know, none of the rites in which the Flaminica was concerned have any direct reference to Juno: see Marquardt, *op. cit.* p. 332. Again, at Falerii, which was especially devoted to the cult of Juno, we hear of no peculiar priestess, but of a pontifex sacarius

of certain female sacerdotesses (*Ov. Amor.* iii. 13; *Dion. Hal.* i. 21). Negatively such evidence as this must be allowed some weight when there is nothing positive to be set against it; and all I am contending for is that we have no right, in the present condition of the evidence, to assume that the Flaminica was Juno's priestess, much less to build upon this assumption important conclusions about the early Italian conception of the relation of Jupiter to Juno. I doubt whether but for such assumptions Dr. Roscher would have seen in the Juno-festival at Falerii (described by Ovid in the passage just quoted) a true Italian equivalent to the *ἱερὸς γάμος* of Zeus and Hera (*Myth. Lex.* s.v. Hera, p. 2101, and s.v. Juno, p. 501); or at any rate he would hardly have jumped at the conclusion that the mysterious flight of Juno in the legend attached to that festival was a flight from the pressing attentions of Jupiter—who is not so much as mentioned by Ovid.

I fear we must still return a verdict of 'not proven' in weighing all attempts to show that before the influence of Greek ideas was felt in Italy there was any distinct tendency at Rome to group the gods in family relations. We may be surprised indeed at this; it seems natural to expect that the Roman's family life should be reflected in his ideas of his gods. But in antiquity we do not always find what we expect. There are some few traces in Italy of pairs of deities, as appears from Gellius xiii. 22; but these are so obscure that we do not know in what sense we are to understand the conjunction of Lua Saturni, Maia Volcani, Nerio Martis, and the rest. It is preposterous to see in such combinations a reflex of Roman family life;² if that were so, we should have something more surviving than obscure names—we should surely have myths, proverbs, and some more obvious indication in the cult. Surely, in order to realize family ties in their supernatural world, the Romans must have proceeded much further on the way towards anthropomorphism than we have any reason to suppose they had done when they came under Greek influences. It should never be forgotten that at no period were they really interested in the gods

¹ *Myth. Lex.* s.v. Juno, p. 590. The text of Plutarch is no doubt uncertain in at least one sentence of this *Quaestio*. But, corrupt or not, no one who reads it carefully will be likely to attach any weight to the words quoted by Roscher.

² As is done e.g. in the most reckless manner by A. Zinzow, *Der Vater-begriff bei den Römischen Gottheiten*, p. 7. It is probable that such conjunctions are 'non per justum matrimonium sed ex officiorum adfinitate': Wissowa, *De feriis anni Romanorum vetustissimi*, p. xi.

themselves, but only in their relations to human beings; and without a lively interest of this kind they were not likely to think of their deities as marrying and begetting children.

But in these notes I wish to limit myself at present to the question whether anything we know of the Flamen and Flaminica Dialis can fairly be used as evidence for the conception of a wedded pair among the Roman gods. I will merely remark in conclusion that a better idea of the true relation of Jupiter and Juno is probably to be found in the article on Hercules (*Myth. Lex.* pp. 2258 foll.), based on the researches of Reifferscheid: and a more probable account of the significance of the Flamen and his wife in Mr. Frazer's invaluable *Golden Bough*, which seems not to have reached the hands of Dr. Roscher and his associates when the articles on Jupiter and Juno were being prepared.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

TORR'S ANCIENT SHIPS.

IN his review of my book Mr. Ridgeway made me assert that we have no representations of ships with more than two tiers of rowers; and then went on to say that I 'had to suppose' that the artist left out a tier of oars in certain representations of triremes. In reply to my disclaimer, he finds fault with me for supposing that these triremes are represented with three tiers of oars, the representations being too inaccurate to warrant that conclusion.

He speaks slightly of these representations: but they are the best we have of triremes, and they agree with what we know from other sources.

In repudiating the assertion that we have no representations of ships with more than two tiers of rowers, I remarked that ships with several tiers may be represented in broadside views on coins, the tiers above concealing those below. But I never cited these coins as evidence that ships had several tiers.

With regard to Mr. Ridgeway's theory that the ancients used to put several men to an oar, or several oars through a rowlock, I must remark that he has not yet produced a scrap of evidence to show that they ever did anything of the kind.

In conclusion he states that it is not his own notion, but the notion of all the leading Semitic scholars, that Tarshish is not Tarsus in Cilicia, but Tartessus in Spain.

The notion seems to have been started by Bochart in 1646. He based it on a statement in Eusebius that Tarshish, the son of Javan, the son of Japheth, was the ancestor of the Iberians.¹ I have never been able to discover any evidence of this; and cannot see any reason for doubting the statement in Josephus that Tarshish was Tarsus in Cilicia.²

¹ Bochart, *Geographia Sacra*, pars 1, lib. 3, cap. 7.

² Josephus, *De Ant. Jud.* i. 6, 1.

Cecil Torr.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Revue de Philologie. Vol. xix. Part 3. July 1895.

Une épigramme sur la bataille d'Actium, F. G. Kenyon. The text is given with amendments and elucidations of this epigram which has been found on the recto of Brit. Mus. Pap. CCLVI. The date is not earlier than 27 B.C., because of the employment of the title *Σεβαστός*. The authorship must remain uncertain, but is probably that of an Alexandrian Greek. This art. is followed by *Remarques sur l'épigramme grecque découverte par M. Kenyon*, H. Weil, who differs in several respects from the interpretation of Mr. Kenyon. *Deux lettres de Cl. de Saumaise à J.-A. de Thou sur les Anthologies grecque et latine* (1615), H. Omont. The first letter gives some account of the various collections of the Greek Anthology, and traces the plan of his proposed new edition (which was in fact never published). The second letter announces his acquisition of a MS.

containing a large number of Latin epigrams. This was the celebrated collection known as the *Codex Salmasianus*. *Nouvelles études sur le manuscrit d'Isocrate du fonds d'Urbain* (concluded from the last No., see *Class. Rev.* sup. p. 382), A. Martin. This deals with the remainder of *Encomium Helenae*, and the *Philippus*. Riese, *Anthol.* 445, L. Havet. From Baehrens, *Poetae Lat. minores*, iv. p. 78-79. The third line is quoted by Loup de Ferrières with *meos* for *nostros*, which should be adopted as Loup had probably a better MS. under his eyes. *De Aristotele primordiisque comoediae atticæ*, F. Susemihl. On three passages of the *Poetics*, viz. 3, 1448a 29 foll., 4, 1449a 9 foll., and 5, 1449a 37 foll. *Babrius CXI, CXIII*, E. Tournier. *Varron*, *Rer. rust.* ii. 5, 5 et *Sat. fragm.* 25, G. Lafaye. These two passages refer to the rhetorician Plotius whom Riese identifies with L. Plotius Gallus, the first who taught rhetoric at Rome in Latin, when Cicero was

still a child. *Nouvelle inscription latine en lettres onciales*, R. Cagnat. An inscription found recently in the baths of Timgad (in N. Africa). From its referring to a known person we can put the date in the earlier part of the 3rd cent. A.D. *Le Troisième mariage de Néron, Statilia Messalina*, P. Fabia. An account of this lady is given. According to schol. Juvenal depicts her in vi. 434 foll.

Journal of Philology. Vol. xxiv. No. 47. 1895.

Various notes on Thuc. VI. and VII., W. E. Heitland. Mostly textual notes. Hude's text edition with full collation of MSS. much commended. *Homer's Similes*, A. Platt. Concludes that Homer does archaize to an extent far greater than Aristarchus observed, and that the civilization of the Homeric poets is not Achaean but Ionian. *The slaying of the Suitors*, A. Platt. Maintains, as against Prof. Jebb, that Odysseus was at the lower end of the hall, not only when he shot the Suitors (as every one allows), but also when he shot the arrow through the axe-heads. *On a Vergilian Idiom*, A. Platt. From the idiom by which V. instead of *et* or *que* repeats a verb or noun (see e.g. Ecl. iv. 6), the text in Soph. Ant. 673 τε...ῆς is defended, where Soph., instead of writing τε or καί, repeats αὐτῇ by ῆς. *Plato Phileb.* 66B, H. Jackson. Reads ἀρ' οὐν οὐδ' for ἀρ' οὐν οὐ τέτραπτε, the scribe having taken Δ of οὐΔ' to mean the ordinal number. *Plato Timaeus* 51B, R. D. Archer-Hind. Maintains that in this passage Plato does not admit to the rank of absolute essences ideas of the four elements, but is asking whether fire is a mere fleeting phenomenon or a determined mode or law in which intelligible essences are apprehended by our senses. *The Attic Civil and Sacred Years*, T. Nicklin. (1) Seeks to show that the well-known inscr. giving the account of the Treasurers of Athena from 426/5 to 423/2, on which in great measure depends our knowledge of the Attic Calendar in the 5th cent. B.C., cannot be correct as at present read, (2) proposes a theory to solve this and other difficulties. *The Trebbia and Lake Trasimene*, G. B. Grundy. Maintains that the difficulty about the sites lies not so much in the typographical detail which is given by Livy and Polybius as in that which is omitted by both. Livy's account has been unduly disparaged. Concludes with an examination and rejection of Mr. Tilley's [here misprinted Lilly] theory in Class. Rev. vii. p. 300, which places the site of the battle of Trasimene on the east side of the lake. *The Carthaginian Councils*, B. W. Henderson. Seeks to show that there were two Councils at Carthage, deliberative and legislative, and one small executive, viz. the Σύγκλητος, a large body of uncertain number, from which was selected the Γερουσία of 104, to which complete legislative and judicial power was delegated by the Συγκ. Finally, of the Γερουσία a body of about 30 formed a small executive. *Lucretiana*, J. P. Postgate. Notes on various passages, chiefly criticisms on Munro and on Brieger (Teubner ed. 1894). *On the new Hecale Fragments and other Callimachea*, R. Ellis. Mr. Kenyon has already published the text in Class. Rev. vii. pp. 429, 430. Gives an interesting account of these fragments which have been edited (with a facsimile) by Prof. Gomperz from Archduke Rainer's tablet at Vienna. Nake had already shown that Ovid drew directly from *Hecale* in his Baucis and Philemon. Col. 4, we have entire [? Mr. Kenyon says the top line is illegible] and singularly we have in this col. two lines already known, viz. 13 from Schol. Ar. Ran. 1297, and Suid., and l. 14 from Schol. Ap. Rhod. iii. 1150.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. xvi. 2. Whole No. 62. July 1895.

The Imperfect and the Aorist in Greek, C. W. E. Miller. A long and elaborate review of Hultsch's *Die erzählenden Zeitformen bei Polybios*, which contains also an independent contribution from the writer's own materials. Hultsch shows weakness in his inadequate treatment of the theoretical side; as an exhaustive study of the facts his work is of inestimable service. *Diminutives in Catullus*, S. B. Platner. In the adjectives there is in most exx. no apparent difference in meaning between the dim. and regular form, while for most nouns the dim. sense is plain. Cat. was unusually fond of both dim. form and meaning, and sometimes he uses the form for itself, through analogy or for metrical reasons. *On a legend of the Alban Lake told by Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, K. F. Smith. A comparison of versions shows that the different narrators felt that the important part in this story was that the king was struck by lightning, but Dionysius and Diodorus give us the most interesting part in telling us how the lake rose and overwhelmed the King Alodius and all his house, and how, to this day, ruins of that house are sometimes to be seen at the bottom. The story was probably rationalized in this direction by the authorities of Dion. and Diod. because of the observed fact of an ancient fall and rise of the Alban Lake. *Lysidem post a. 394 a. Chr. n. compositum esse*, A. Wirth. Argues that there is an allusion in the *Lysis* to Xen. Mem. 2, 6, 9, that the latter work was not published before 394 B.C.; and that consequently the *Lysis* must be placed after that date. In *Further Notes on the Origin of the Gerund and Gerundive*, Mr. L. Horton-Smith adds to his former art. [see Class. Rev. viii. 474] a further list of compounds from Sanscrit, Greek, Italic, &c., in which the first member is in the accus. case, governed as object by the second member. Next follows a long and valuable review of Jowett and Campbell's *Plato's Republic* by Prof. Shorey, who finds these volumes disappointing on the whole. The work is too costly and ponderous for college, and yet it cannot be considered a monumental achievement like Munro's *Lucretius* or Jebb's *Sophocles*. The other classical books noticed are Blase's *Geschichte des Plusquam-perfects im Lateinischen*, and Ries' *Was ist Syntax?* Briefly mentioned are Dr. R. F. Weymouth's paper *On the rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect*, reprinted from the 'Theological Monthly' for July and Sep. 1890, Dr. Verrall's *Euripides, the Rationalist*, and the etymology of αἰγλάφ which remains a puzzle.

Rheinisches Museum. Vol. 50. Part 4. 1895.

Die peregrinen Gaugemeinden des römischen Reichs, A. Schulten. A long article describing the process of the absorption of the provinces into the Roman Empire. The writer gives details concerning the constitution, raising of levies, taxation, &c. of the various provinces. *Antikritische Streifzüge*, II., O. Ribbeck. Some notes on the *Dirae* with reference to recent criticism. *Thukydides über das alte Athen vor Theseus*, J. M. Stahl. Maintains that Dörpfeld fails to reconcile his theory of the position of the Lenaeon and Enneakrounos with the account in Thuc. ii. 15, 2. *Anecdota medica Graeca*, R. Fuchs. Continued from vol. 49, Part 4 [Class. Rev. sup. p. 1416]. Appendix to cod. Paris. Suppl. Graec. 636. Collation of the text 85 v.—112 r. with elucidations. Also a description of the medical contents of cod. Paris. Graec. 2324. *Nekyia*, E. Rohde. A reconsideration of the analysis of the *Nekyia* given in the

writer's 'Psyche,' occasioned by reading P. Cauer's *Grundrissen der Homerkritik*. The whole Nekyia was wanting in the original *Odyssey*.

MISCELLAN. *Die chaldäischen Orakel*, W. Kroll. Considers it a document of heathen Gnosticism, the date about 200 A.D. *Das Ikariongebirge*, R. Förster. In the Jerusalem epitome of Apollodor. (= Apollod. bibl. epit. 3, 21) ἐν ἱκαρίῳ βαλὼν ἑλαφόν must be emended to ἐν καιρίῳ βαλὼν τὴν ἑλαφόν. Zu Q. *Serenus (Sammonicus)* and Zu *Mazimianus*, M. Manitius. *Fortuna populi Romani*, J. Ziehen. In Justin. 30, 4, 16 and 39, 5, 3, where the words *fortuna Romana* occur, we should write *Fortuna* in both places.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. Vol. 151. Part 7. 1895.

Über das vierte Homerische epigramm, R. Peppmüller. Reconstructs by omitting ll. 6, 7, reading in l. 10 αἰδοῦ, and for l. 12 ὅττι β' ὀνειδε' ἐς αἶν' ἐμὸν δι' ἀμύματο πτόμον. Noch einmal die gliederung des Platonischen dialogs Gorgias, C. Schirlitz. Concluded from the last Part. A criticism on Cron's edition. Noch einmal Θύρρειον und Τορόβεια, H. Pomtow. Τύρρειον of the Delphic text is to be identified with the well-known Acarnanian town Θύρρειον and not with Τορόβεια. Über das verhältniss der Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία zu den naturwissenschaftlichen schriften und zur politik des Aristoteles, M. Pokrowsky. Seeks to show that the Ἀθ. πολ. consists not of two, but of eleven closely connected pieces of various extent. The Athenian political arrangements are in all these pieces described in the proportion which is necessary from the standpoint of Aristotle's political teaching. Die sogenannte Drakontische verfäassung, F. Blass. There is no contradiction between the Ἀθ. πολ. and the Politics. In both Ar. says that Dracon made his laws for an already existing constitution. Zu Curtius und Thukydides, K. Fulda. By comparing Curt. iv. 3, 13 with Thuc. ii. 76, 3 it is concluded that C. in

describing the siege of Tyre has copied Thuc.'s description of the siege of Plataea. A review by G. Friedrich of Krüger's Q. *Horatius Flaccus satiren und episteln*, 13th edition. The edition of Krüger stands at the head of Horatian criticism, but that criticism itself is still far from a settled conclusion. Zu *Plautus Persa*, E. Redslob. In *Persa* 120 reads *nili parasitus est quoi* (or *parasitus quōis*) *Argentum-prōmideat*. Zu *Cornelius Nepos*, J. Lange. In *Dion.* 1, 4 reads *crudelissimum animum* (for *nomen*) *tyranni sua humanitate leniebat*. But in a note Fleckeisen reminds the writer that *leniebat* is only a conj. of Lambinus for cod. reading *tenebat*.

Part 8. *Nundinalfragen* i.-iv., G. F. Unger. Attempts to reach the time of old-Roman dates according to the Julian calendar by a calculation of the market days, which we know, and which occurred every eight days (*nono quoque die*). *Die grundzahlen-theorie und die responson des Herakles*, J. Oeri. An answer to some of C. Conradt's criticisms in 1894 accompanied by a table of the distribution of the play. Zu *Euripides Herakles*, K. Frey. A few critical notes. *Die chronologischen angaben des Pausanias*, F. Reuss. It is probable that the source from which Pausanias derived his dates for his description of Greece was the *χρονικά* of Apollodorus. *Der Jerusalemer biograph Alexanders des groszen*, F. Rühl. On a fragment in the patriarchal library at Jerusalem, published in 1892. Two quotations in *Snidas* are from it and attributed to an unknown author. Zu *Ovidius Ars Amatoria*, W. Bannier. In l. 332 the line *pube premit rabidos inguinibusque canes* seems to have been introduced from Am. iii. 12, 22, and to have thrust out the original line. Zur textkritik von *Ovidiusfasten*, E. Samter. *De Apulei metamorphoseon codice Dorvilliano*, O. Rossbach. Maintains that this cod. (called δ), though it has much in common with F (Laur. 68, 2) and φ (Laur. 29, 2), is not derived from either of them, but is of a separate family, and is of as much value as φ in constituting the text.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH BOOKS.

- Allcroft* (A. H.) and *Mason* (W. F.) *Rome under the Oligarchs: a history of Rome, 202-133 B.C.:* and *Mason* (W. F.) *The Decline of the Oligarchy: a history of Rome, 133-78 B.C. in 1 vol.* Cr. 8vo. 316 pp. Clive. 6s. 6d.
- Brugmann* (K.) *A Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic languages.* Indices of vols. 1 to 4, translated by R. S. Conway and W. H. D. Rouse. 8vo. 258 pp. Kegan Paul. 9s.
- Buckler* (W. H.) *The Origin and History of Contract in Roman Law down to the End of the Republican period: being the Yorke Prize Essay for the year 1893.* Cr. 8vo. 240 pp. Clay. 3s. 6d.
- Cæsar.* *Gallie War.* Books 3 to 5, edited by M. T. Tatham, illustrated. 12mo. 180 pp. E. Arnold. 1s. 6d. net.
- Cicero.* *The Second Philippic.* A literal translation by J. A. Prout. 12mo. 50 pp. Sewed. Cornish. 1s. 6d.
- Cook* (A. B.) *The Metaphysical Basis of Plato's Ethics.* Cr. 8vo. 176 pp. Bell & Sons. 6s.
- Darbishire* (H. D.) *Reliquiae philologicae, or Essays in Comparative Philology,* edited by R. S. Conway, with a biographical notice by J. E. Sandys. 8vo. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d.
- Hartland* (E. S.) *The Legend of Perseus.* Vol. II. *A Study in Story, Custom, and Belief.* Cr. 8vo. 456 pp. Nutt. 12s. 6d.
- Herodotus* IV., V., VI., with introduction, notes, appendices, indices, and maps, by R. W. Macan. 2 vols. Roy. 8vo. Pp. 516 and 354. Macmillan. 32s.
- Book I. A literal translation by J. A. Prout. 12mo. 98 pp. Sewed. Cornish. 2s.
- Homer.* *Ilias.* Edited by Walter Leaf. Cr. 8vo. 380 pp. Macmillan. 6s. net.
- *Iliad.* Edited with general and grammatical introductions, notes, and appendices (in 2 vols.). Vol. I. Books 1-12. 12mo. 632 pp. Macmillan. 6s.
- Livy.* Book XXI. text, with notes, vocabulary and translation. Edited by A. H. Allcroft and W. F. Mason. Cr. 8vo. 280 pp. Clive. 4s. 6d.
- Mackail* (J. W.) *Latin Literature.* Cr. 8vo. 298 pp. Murray. 3s. 6d.
- Manual of Greek Antiquities.* Books I.-V. by P.

- Gardner; Books VI.—X. by F. B. Jevons. With illustrations. Cr. 8vo. 748 pp. Griffin. 16s.
 Platonis Ion et Hippia Minor. For the upper forms of Schools. Edited by George Smith. Cr. 8vo. 130 pp. Rivington. 3s. 6d.
 Ramsay (G. G.) Latin Prose Composition. 3rd edition. Vol. I. in 2 parts. 12mo. Frowde. 2s. 6d. each.
 Sophocles. The Ajax and Electra. Translated into English prose, with an introduction by E. D. A. Morshead. Cr. 8vo. 138 pp. Methuen. 2s. 6d.

- Stedman (A. M. M.) Steps in Greek. 16mo. limp. 70 pp. Methuen. 1s.
 Virgil. The Greater Poems of Virgil, containing the first Six Books of the Aeneid. Edited by Professor J. B. Greenough and G. L. Kittredge, illustrated. 12mo. (Boston). 7s. 6d.
 — The Story of Aeneas: Selections from the Aeneid of Virgil. With a continuous narrative in English. Part I. (Aeneid I.—VI.) compiled, with introductions, notes and vocabulary by A. H. Allcroft, illustrated. 12mo. 200 pp. Blackie. 2s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Amelung (W.) Die Basis des Praxiteles aus Mantinea. Archäologische Studien. München, Verlagsanstalt. Royal 8vo. 82 pp. 29 engravings, 1 plate. 4 Mk.
 Cicero. Lüders (F.) Chrestomathia Ciceroniana. 3rd edition, by O. Weissenfels. 8vo. xvi, 281 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 80.
 Corpus inscriptionum etruscarum, admin. A. Danielsson et C. Pauli. Segmentum 2—4. (2, pp. 75—114. 10 Mk. 3, pp. 115—154. 10 Mk. 4, pp. 155—224. 20 Mk.) Leipzig, Barth. folio. 40 Mk.
 Costanzi (V.) Sulla relazione tra il Mito di Demetra e quello di Persefone. 8vo. Messina. 10 S.
 Dehio (G.) Ein Proportionsgesetz der antiken Baukunst und sein Nachleben im Mittelalter und in der Renaissance. 36 pp., 60 plates. Strassburg, Trübner. 10 Mk.
 Demetrius. Dahl (K.) Demetrius περί ἐμπνεύσεως. Ein Beitrag zur Bestimmung der Abfassungszeit der Schrift. 8vo. München. 112 S.
 Demosthenes. Schefczik (H.) Die erste philippische Rede ist zweifellos ein Ganzes. 8vo. Troppau. 27 pp.
 Diophranti Alexandrini opera omnia cum graecis commentariis. Ed. P. Tannery. Vol. II. Pseud-epigraphia, testimonia veterum, Pachymerae paraphrasis, Planudis commentarius, scholia vetera, cum prolegomenis et indicibus. 8vo. lxxvii, 298 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 5 Mk.
 Elter (A.) De Gnomologiorum Graecorum historia atque origine commentatio part. IX. (De Aristobulo Judaeo V.) 4to. Bonn. 1895. 14 S.
 Fallis (O. B.) Pausanias auf der Agora von Athen. 8vo. 59 pp., 1 plate. München.
 Geoponica sive Cassiani Bassi scholastici de re rustica eclogae, rec. H. Beckh. 12mo. xxxviii, 641 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 10 Mk.
 Germer-Durand (E. et F.) et A. Allmer, Inscriptions antiques de Nîmes, publiées sous les auspices de la commission archéologique de Nîmes. 8vo. xv, 1100 pp. Toulouse.
 Grammatik (historische) der lateinischen Sprache. Bearbeitet von H. Blass, J. Golling, G. Landgraf, J. H. Schmalz, Fr. Stolz, Jos. Thüssing und A. Weinhold. Vol. I. Part II. Einleitung, Lautlehre, Stammbildungslehre von Fr. Stolz. II. Stammbildungslehre. 8vo. vi, pp. 365—706. Leipzig, Teubner. 7 Mk.
 Hippocratis quae feruntur omnia. Vol. I. rec. H. Kühlewein. Prolegomena conscrips. I. Ilberg et H. Kühlewein. 8vo. cxxxii, 248 pp., 1 facsimile plate. Leipzig, Teubner. 6 Mk.
 Homer. Gedichte. Part I. Odyssee, bearbeitet von O. Henke. Kommentar. 8vo. vi, 238 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
 Homer. Odyssee, erklärt von K. F. Ameis. Vol. II. Part I. (Cantus xiii.—xviii.) 8th edition, by C. Henze. 8vo. 186 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 35.
 — Jelinek (Fr.) Homerische Untersuchungen. I. Die Widersprüche im zweiten Theil der Odyssee. Versuch einer Herstellung der Verwandlungsodysee. 8vo. 50 pp. Wien, Holder. 1 Mk.
 — Knötel (A. F. R.) Homeros, der Blinde von Chios, und seine Werke. Vol. II. (completing the work). 8vo. xvi, 396 pp. Leipzig, Grunow. 4 Mk. 50.
 Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft, begründet von Conr. Bursian, herausgegeben von Prof. Iwan von Müller. Vol. 87. Supplement to Series III. Part I.: Jahresbericht über die italienischen Sprachen, auch das Altlateinische, Etruskische und Venetische für die Jahre 1884—93. Von W. Deecke. 8vo. Pp. 1—96. Berlin, Calvary. 3 Mk. 60.
 Juvenalis Saturarum libri V. Mit erklärenden Anmerkungen von Ludw. Friedländer. 2 vols. 8vo. 612, 108 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 14 Mk.
 Katz (Eb.) Cyrus des Perserkönigs Abstammung, Kriege und Tod, nach den gewöhnlichsten überlieferten Sagen. 8vo. 44 pp. Klagenfurt. 1 Mk.
 Keller (O.) Zur lateinischen Sprachgeschichte. Vol. II. Grammatische Aufsätze. 8vo. viii, 405 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 14 Mk.
 Knoke (F.) Die römischen Moorbrücken in Deutschland. 8vo. 4 maps, 5 plates, 5 engravings. iv, 138 pp. Berlin, Gärtner. 5 Mk.
 Lactantius. Frotscher (P. G.) Des Apologeten Lactantius. Verhältniss zur griechischen Philosophie. 8vo. 92 pp. Leipzig.
 Liers (H.) Das Kriegswesen der Alten mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Strategie. 8vo. viii, 391 pp. Breslau, Koebner. 9 Mk.
 Livius. Haupt (C.) Livius=Commentar für den Schulgebrauch. Buch VIII.—X. 8vo. 119 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 20.
 Lysias. Holmes (D.) Index Lysiacus. 8vo. vii, 213 pp. Bonn, Cohen. 8 Mk.
 Magne (L.) Le Parthénon. Études faites au cours de deux missions en Grèce (1894—95). 4to. x, 132 pp., plates and engravings. Paris, Impr. nationale.
 Margalits (Ed.) Florilegium proverbiorum universae latinitatis. Proverbia, proverbiales sententiae gnomaeque classicae, mediae et infimae latinitatis. 8vo. 548 pp. Budapest. 5 Mk.
 Meinel (G.) Dionysos oder Longinos, über das Erhabene. 8vo. 58 pp. Kempten.
 Morawski (Cas.) De sermone scriptorum latinorum

- aetatis quae dicitur argentea observationes. (Aus 'Eos.') 8vo. 12 pp. Leopoli. 60 Pf.
- Philetas*. Maass (E.) De tribus Philetæ carminibus. 4to. 14 pp. Marburg. 1 Mk.
- Philodemi Volumina rhetorica ed. S. Sudhaus. Supplementum. 8vo. xlii, 62 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Plato*. Landwehr, Ueber die Echtheit des platonischen Dialogs Laches und seine Verwendbarkeit in Gymnasialunterricht. 4to. 25 pp. Ravensburg.
- Rosenstock* (P. E.) Die Akten der Arval-Brüderschaft, eine Studie zur lateinischen Rechtschreibung. 4to. 27 pp. Strasburg.
- Sallustius, Bellum Catilinae, herausgegeben von C. Stegmann. Text. 8vo. 56 pp., 1 map. Leipzig, Teubner. 70 Pf.
- Bellum Jugurthinum, orationes, orationes et epistolae, historiis excerptae, erklärt von Th. Opitz. Part II. Bellum Jugurthinum. 8vo. iii, 93 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk.
- Scheele* (L.) Abriss der lateinischen und griechischen Moduslehre in paralleler Darstellung. 8vo. iv, 73 pp. Marburg, Elwert. 1 Mk. 80.
- Seneca*. Gercke (Alfr.) Seneca-Studien. (Aus. 'Jahrbuch für classische Philologie' Suppl. XXII) 8vo. 334 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 9 Mk.
- Sittl* (C.) Die Grenzbezeichnung der Römer. Ein Beitrag zur Limes-Frage. Mit Anhang: Nachrichten zu den 'Parerga'. 4to. 24 pp. 1894. Würzburg.
- Solini* (C. Julii.) Collectanea rerum memorabilium, iterum rec. Th. Mommsen. 8vo. cv, 276 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 14 Mk.
- Sophocles Tragoedien, herausgegeben von C. Conradt. II. König Oedipus. Text. 8vo. 64 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 80 Pf.
- Kohn (J.) Die Composition der Sophocleischen Tragoedie 'Oidipus Tyrannos.' II. 8vo. 31 pp. Wien.
- Sturm* (A.) Das delische Problem. Progr. 8vo. 56 pp. Seitenstetten.
- Thukydides*. Auswahl für den Schulgebrauch von H. Stein. Pt. I. Text. 8vo. vi, 180 pp. Notes 62 pp. Cloth. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 Mk.
- Corstens (J. F.) De translationibus quibus usus est Thucydides. 8vo. viii, 150 pp. Leiden.
- Juillard (A.) Emploi et signification de la préposition *κατά* dans Thucydide. 8vo. 132 pp. Bern.
- Kirchhoff (A.) Thukydides und sein Urkundenmaterial. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte seines Werkes. 8vo. iii, 179 pp. Berlin, Besser. 3 Mk. 60.
- Thümmen* (F.) Die Iphigeniensage in antikem und modernem Gewande. 2nd Edition. 8vo. 47 pp. Berlin. 1 Mk.
- Treu* (M.) Dichtungen des Gross-Logotheten Theodoros Metochites. (Griechisch.) 8vo. 54 pp. Potsdam.
- Tryphiodorus*. Ludwig (A.) Tryphiodorea. 4to. 8 pp. Königsberg.
- Urkunden (Aegyptische) aus den Königl. Museen zu Berlin. Herausgegeben von der Generalverwaltung. Griechische Urkunden. Vol. I. Pt. 12. (Indices and Additions.) iv. pp. 353—399, 2 plates. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 Mk. 40.
- Vegetius*. Foerster (W.) Quaestiones Vegetianae. 4to. 9 pp. Rheydt.
- Vergili Maronis Opera, apparatu critico in artius contracto iterum rec. Otto Ribbeck. Vol. II., III. 8vo. Pp. 209—840. Leipzig, Teubner. Each Vol. 7 Mk. 20.
- Opera, apparatu critico in artius contracto iterum rec. O. Ribbeck. Vol. IV. Appendix Vergiliana. 8vo. vi, 101 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.
- idem, cum appendice, in usum scholarum iterum recogn. O. Ribbeck. Praemisit de vita et scriptis poetae narrationem. 8vo. xli, 493 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 50.
- Aeneide (in Auswahl), herausgegeben von M. Fickelscherer. Text. 8vo. vi, 196 pp., map. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 40.
- Vergilius*. Irmischer (E.) Vergils Aeneide. Buch IX. 4to. 10 pp. Dresden.
- Jacobson (A. J.) In Nocyam Virgilianam studia nonnulla. 8vo. 48 pp. Upsala.
- Kunz (F.) Realien in Vergil's Aeneis. II. 8vo. 36 pp. Wiener-Neustadt. 1 Mk.
- (Continuation: Götterwelt und Sacralwesen.)
- Le Breton (A.) De animalibus apud Virgilium. 8vo. 115 pp. Paris, Oudin.
- Sonntag (M.) Vergil Ecl. IX., 46-50. 8vo. 7 pp. Frankfurt.
- Vitruvius*. Thiel (M.) Quae ratio intercedat inter Vitruvium et Athenaeum Mechanicum. 8vo. 52 pp. Leipzig.
- Weber* (F.) Das palatinische Pomerium. 8vo. 21 pp. Briix.
- Weise* (R.) Der athenische Bundesgenossenkrieg. 4to. 40 pp. Berlin.
- Weiske* (A.) Beiträge zur griechischen Grammatik. 4to. 15 pp. Halle.
- Weniger* (O.) Der heilige Ölbaum in Olympia. 4to. 21 pp. Weimar.
- Wessely* (C.) Ein System altgriechischer Tachygraphie. (Aus 'Denkschriften der K.K. Akademie der Wissenschaften.') Imperial 4to. 44 pp., 4 plates. Wien, Gerold. 3 Mk. 50.
- Willamowitz-Moellendorf* (U.) Commentariolum metricum II. 8vo. 34 pp. Göttingen. 50 Pf.
- Willrich* (H.) Juden und Griechen vor der makabäischen Erhebung. 8vo. v, 176 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck. 4 Mk.
- Wilms* (A.) Die Schlacht bei Cannae. 4to. 29 pp., 1 map. Hamburg, Herold. 2 Mk.
- Winckelmannsprogramm, (18. Hallisches): Die Marathonschlacht in der Poikile und Weiteres über Polygnot von C. Robert. 4to. 126 pp., 12 engravings, 1 plate. Halle, Niemeyer. 12 Mk.
- Xenophon's Anabasis in Auswahl, herausgegeben von F. G. Sorof. Erklärungen: Hilfsheft und Commentar. 8vo. iv, 72, 165 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 1 Mk. 80.
- Xenophon*. Vogel (G.) Die Oekonomik des Xenophon. Eine Vorarbeit für eine Geschichte der griechischen Oekonomik. 8vo. 85 pp. Erlangen, Mencke. 1 Mk. 20.

INDEX.

Note.—In the General Index names of actual contributors, in the Index Locorum references to passages discussed, are printed in heavy type.

I.—GENERAL INDEX.¹

A.

- Abbott (Edwin A.)**, notes on some passages in Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*, 253 ff.
criticisms on the above, 419a, b (n.)
- Abbott (Evelyn)**, notice of Hauvette's *Hérodote, historien des guerres Médiques*, 169 f.
- Abercius Inscription, Harnack on the, noticed, 295 ff.
its Christian (?) character, 295a
- a-bor, 216b
- Aborigines, the, 219b
origin of the word, *ib.*
- accent, importance of in philology, 115a
- accereso*(*acresco*), 264b
- accusative, Streitberg's theory of the, 116b
- Acta* of Mucianus and the *Dialogus* of Tacitus, the, 45b
- Actionsart* or *Zeitart*(*Zeitsstufe* of the grammatical tense, 289b
denoted by tenses of all moods but indicative, 290a
- Acts (i. 18), the reading of in Papias, 258
- Acts of Apollonius, the, 129b
- Address by Prof. Jebb to the Hellenic Society on Sir C. T. Newton, 81 ff.
- adlecti inter quaestorios*, 442a
- adlectio*, *ib.*
- Aeduan chiefs and Claudius, the, 441 ff.
- Aeschylus *Agamemnon*, the unities in, 214a, b
- albucua*, 12b
- albulis*, *ib.*
- alburnus*, *ib.*
- Alexander and the Diadochi, 58b, 59a
- Alexandria, finds at near Pompey's Pillar, 93b, 429a, b
Troas, coin-types of, 333b
furnished from Neandria and Hamaxitus, *ib.*
- Alexandrian poets and Greek lyrists, the, 39a, 42b
- Alexandrines and Byzantines, the, 318a
their principle of analogy, 320a
- Algonkin women, superstition of, 249a
- Allen (T. W.)**, notice of Gehring's *Index Homericus*, 415 ff.
on descriptive names of animals in Greece [see *Cl. Rev.* viii. 381 ff.], 13
- American School of Classical Studies in Rome, the, 467a
- Ancient Ships*, Torr's, noticed, 265 f. (see 378 f. 476)
- Ancona, discoveries at, 138b, 139a
- Andronicus of Rhodes, *floruit* of, 429a
- anquisitio*, 5 ff.
- Antandros, coins of, 334a
- Anthologia Palatina*, classification of the 'Ερωτικά, 261b
Jacobs' ed. of the, 261a
Stadtmüller's ed. of the, noticed, 261 f.
- 'anti-comparative' school of German philologists, the, 404a
- Aoristus Tragicus*, the, 346b
- Aphidnae (Attica), excavations at, 93a, 335b
- Apollo Smintheus, coin-type of Hamaxitus, 333b
- Apollo the Wind-god, 413 ff.
- Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile*, De Mirmont's, noticed, 175 ff.
- Apollonius Rhodius and Callimachus, 176b
- Apuleius, style of, 462b
- Archaeology, 85 ff., 133 ff., 186 f., 236 f., 269 ff., 333 ff., 370 ff., 421 ff., 467 ff.
- Areopagus, attacks on the by Ephialtes and Pericles, 108a, b
- Arezzo, terracotta fragments at, 139a
- Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus, *Study* of the, Summers', noticed, 111 ff.
- Argos, discovery of colonnade at, 237b
- Aristophanes *Clouds*, attack on Cleon in (?), 307a, b
Kock's ed. of, noticed, 172 ff.
- Wasps* (136-229), arrangement of, 122a, b
- Blaydes' ed. of, 117a
- Graves' ed. of, noticed, 121 ff.
- Merry's ed. of, noticed, 117 ff.
notes on, 306 f.
- Aristotle *Nicomachean Ethics*, etc., testimonia for the text of, 1 ff.
- Πολιτεία 'Αθηναίων*, divisions of, 478a
notes on, 106 ff.
papyrus, date of, 466a
- Politics*, Sussemlil and Hicks' ed. of, noticed, 454 ff.
- Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, Butcher's, noticed, 213 ff.
use of *πεινέρεα* in the *Poetics*, 251 ff.
view of Euripides, 412b
- Aristoxenians and Pythagoreans, the, 425b (n.)
- Aristoxenus on Greek music, 79a, 80a, b, 178b, 422a (n.), 424a
- Armenia, Roman interference in, 303a
- ἀρμωρία* and *ῥόσος* in Greek music, 79 ff.
Plutarch's use of, 80b, 81a

¹ The Index is by W. F. R. SHILLETO, M.A., formerly Foundation Scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge.
NO. LXXXIII. VOL. IX.

ἀπορίας in Aristides Quintilianus, 81*b*
 in Plato and Aristotle, 80*b*
 'Aryan hypothesis' of Greek mythology, the, 67*b*
 Asconius' comments on the *Pro Milone*, 331*a*
ascopera, 109 f.
 Asia Minor, discoveries in, 93*b*
 Asklepios Hippios, 138*b*
 Aspasia and Pericles, relations between, 364*b*
 Assus, coin-type of, 333*b*
Assyrica, Hilprecht's, noticed, 215 ff.
 Athenian degeneracy in third century, alleged, 59*a*
 stone theatre, date of the ancient, 472*a*, *b*
 Athens, discoveries at, 139*b*, 335*a*
 Attic perfects, Apollonius on, 320*a*
 year, intercalation in the, 30 f.
 Augusta Praetorianorum (Aosta), triumphal arch at, 303*b*
Augusti tropaea, 303 f.
 Augustus and the Armenians, 303*a*, *b*
 coins connected with, *ib.*
 and the Scythians, 303*a*
 axe as coin-type, the, 334*a*, *b*

B.

Bagehot and the style of Hume and Adam Smith, 458*b*
 Baker's *Latin and Greek Verse Translations*, noticed, 369 f.
 Bakis, oracles of, 281*b*
Barton (George A.), notice of Hilprecht's *Assyrica*, 215 ff.
 Baudrillart's *Les Divinités de la Victoire en Grèce et en Italie d'après les textes et les monuments figurés*, noticed, 187
 Belling's *Kritische Prolegomena zu Tibull und Quaesiones Tibullianae*, noticed, 74 ff.
 Bêlnâdinapli, inscription on, 215*b*
 Bennett's *Tacitus, Dialogus de Oratoribus*, noticed, 48 f.
 Bentley on Juvenal (xii. 48-51), 348*a*, *b*
 Bérard's *Essai de Méthode en Mythologie Grecque: De l'Origine des Celles Arcadiens*, noticed, 67 ff.
 Bernard's Catalogue of Bodleian MSS., 367 f.
bhârâyati, 117*a*
 Bible, great uncial MSS. of the attributed to Egyptian scribes, 466*b*
 Bibliography, 142 ff., 191 f., 240, 287 f., 336, 382 ff., 431 f., 478 ff.
 Birt's *Claudii Claudiani carmina* ['Monumenta Germaniae Historica,' vol. x.], noticed, 162 ff.
visellium, 423*b*
 Blake's *Hellenica* (i. and ii.) and *Selections from Lysias and Aristotle*, noticed, 231
 Blass' *Hyperidis Orationes Sex cum ceterarum Fragmentis*, noticed, 73 f.
 views on *Tempuslehre* (in Demosthenes), 343*b*
 on the tenses of the N.T., 446*a*, *b*
 Blaydes' *Adversaria in Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, noticed, 49 f.
 boar's head as coin-type, the, 334*b*
 Bochart on the locality of Tarshish, 476*b*
 Bodleian MS. of Epictetus, Schenkl's ed. of, noticed, 31 ff.
 and Schenkl's collation of Book i., 37 ff.
Western MSS. in the, Madan's Catalogue of, noticed, 367 ff.
 Boghaz-Keui (Pterium), cuneiform inscriptions at, 93*b*
 Book of the Dead and the Eleusinian τὰ ἀνέπρητα, the, 474*a*
 Boscoreale (Pompeii), bath-room at, 93*a*

Bosius, the fictitious MSS. of, 241 ff.
 'Boss of Tarkondemos,' the, 216*b*
Βούλομαι in Homer, 393 ff.
 and *θέλω* contrasted in Buttmann's *Lexilogus*, 393*a*, *b*
brevis brevians, law of the, 404*a*
 Brieger's *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, noticed, 207 ff.
 British Museum, acquisition of Greek coins by in 1894, 380*a*
 Odyssey papyrus, date of, 466*a*
 Sir C. T. Newton's connexion with, 83*a*, *b*
Brown (J. Wood), Corrections in the Florence MS. of Nonius, 396 ff., 447 ff.
 Brugmann on *Tempuslehre*, 291*b*, 343*b*
 Buck's *The Ocean-Umbrian Verb-System*, noticed, 460 f.
 Budrum and the Mausoleum, 82*b*, 83*a*
 Bulgaria, find of Greek coins in, 238*a*
 Burchard of Worms on funeral superstitions, 247*b*
Bury (J. B.), notes on Aristotle's Πολιτεία Ἀθηναίων, 106 ff.
 notice of Holm's *Greek History*, 57 ff.
Bury (R. G.), note on Lucretius (iii. 962), 156
 note on Varro *Sat. Menipp.* (*Eumen.* 16, 17), 156*b*
 Butcher's *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, noticed, 213 ff.
 Butler's *L'Origine Siciliana dell' Odissea—Ancora sull' Origine Siciliana dell' Odissea*, noticed, 56 f.
 Buttmann on *Tempuslehre*, 145*a*, 290*b*, 291*a*
 Bywater (Ingram) and the Bodleian codex of Epictetus, 31*a*, 233*a*, 235*a*, *b*
 suggestions on the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria, 98 ff., 202*b*, 203*b*, 298*b*, 299*a*, 301*b*, 302*b*, 337 ff., 387*a*
 Byzantines and Alexandrines, the, 318*a*

C.

cacabulus (= 'bell'), 93*a*
 Caesar's military despotism, 124*b*
 Cagnat's *Lexique des Antiquités Romaines*, Goyau's ed. of, noticed, 229
 calf's head as coin-type, the, 334*b*
 Callixenus' description of Ptolemy's tent (*ap. Athenaeus*), 275*a*
 of the forty-banked ship (*ap. Athenaeus*), 266*a*, *b*
 Caltrano Vicentino (Venetia), coin-find at, 139*a*
calybita, 367*b*
 Campanian peasants in Petronius, speech of the, 462*b*
Campbell (Lewis), notice of Blaydes' *Fragmenta of the Greek Tragedians*, 49 f.
 notice of Rogers' *Emendations in Aeschylus*, etc., 362 f.
cánnōt(*can't*), 115*b*
Capps (Edward), notice of Christ on the Greek Stage, 133 ff.
 notice of Schneidewin-Nauack's *Trachiniae and Electra*, 211 ff.
 Caria, exploration of, 188*a*, *b*
 Carthage, councils at, 477*a*
 excavations of amphitheatre at, 238*a*
 of tombs at, 379*b*
 Père Delattre's excavations at, 93*b*, 238*a*
 Castellazzo di Fontanellato (Parma), excavations in the *terremare* at, 237*b*
Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Troas, Acolis, and Lesbos, Wroth's, noticed, 333 ff.
 of *Western MSS. in the Bodleian, Madan's*, noticed, 367 ff.

- catamitus*, 367b
 Catiline's character overdrawn by Cicero, 264a
Catulle et ses modèles, Lafaye's, noticed, 39 ff.
Catulliana, 304 ff.
 Catullus and the Alexandrian poets and Greek lyrists, 39a, 42b
 or Horace the greater lyrist (?), 41a
 Cauer's *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*, noticed, 463 ff.
causa capitalis, appeals in a, 6a
caussa (causa), Cicero's spelling of, 332b
Cernunnos of Autun, the, 137a
cestus, use of the (in Homer and Valerius Flaccus), 112b
 Chaeremon, style of, 106a
 Chalcetor, coins of (?), 188a (n.)
 site of, 188a
Chambers (C. D.), on the classification of Conditional Sentences, 293 f.
Chawner (W.), note on Suetonius *Nero* (45), 109 f.
 Chester, foundation of, 236a
 Chesterford (Great), discoveries near Roman camp at, 93a
Chinnock (E. J.), note on *Θεοδωρος*, 110
 Choeroboscus and Apollonius and Herodian, 319 f.
 and Theodosius, 318 f.
 his career and *floruit*, 318a
 proximity, 319
 Christ on the Greek Stage, noticed, 133 ff.
 v. Dörpfeld, 134 ff.
Christianity and the Roman Government, Hardy's, noticed, 129
 Christmas-trees, origin of, 89b
chroma tonation and the Hymn to Apollo, the, 177 f.
 Chrysippus *περὶ παθῶν ἀγωγῆς* and the *Dialogus* of Tacitus, 45b
 Church's *Historical and Political Odes of Horace*, noticed, 267
 Cicero a hero of the Roman Republic, 123a
 and the *Fall of the Roman Republic*, Strachan-Davidson's, noticed, 123 ff.
 his absence of jealousy, 123b
 attraction to Pompey, 124a
 encouragement of young men, 125a
 loyalty to friends, 123b
 oversubtle intellect, 124b
 Reid's edd. of, 330 f.
 the tragedy of his political life, 124a
 Cicero's *Catiline Orations*, Wilkins' ed. of, noticed, 263 ff.
 Hortensius and the *Dialogus* of Tacitus, 45b
 Letters, Tyrrell and Purser's ed. of, noticed, 42 ff.
 Pro Milone, Reid's ed. of, noticed, 330 ff.
 Civita Lavinia, inscribed cup-fragment at, 428b
civitas sine suffragio and its date, 441a
civitates foederatae (*liberae*), 224a
Clark (Albert C.), on the fictitious MSS. of Bosius, 241 ff.
Clarke (Henry), notice of Hoess on the style of Isocrates, 126 f.
 Classification of Conditional Sentences, 293 f.
 Claudian, Birt's and Koch's edd. of, noticed, 162 ff.
 date and place of his birth, 163a, b
 his alleged Graecisms, 163b
 attitude towards Christianity, 164b, 165a
 MSS. of, 165 ff.
 poet laureate of Stilicho, 164a
 statue erected to, *ib.*
 Claudius and the chiefs of the Aedui, 441 ff.
 measures of against Druidism, 443b
 Clement of Alexandria's *Stromateis*, critical notes on, 97 ff., 202 ff., 297 ff., 337 ff., 385 ff., 433 ff.
 Cleon attacked in the *Clouds* of Aristophanes (?), 307a, b
 Climate in disguise, a, 311
 Clyde on the pres. and aor. in Greek jussives, 145b, 344b
 codex Marchalianus, facsimile of the, 466b
 Salmasianus, 476b
Colby (Frederic T.), note on S. Matt. (xi. 19), 312
 Colle del Vallona, tomb-excavations at, 139a
comitia centuriata, 224a
 tributa populi, 224a, b
 'concluded action,' the function of the aorist stem, 444 f.
 Conditional Sentences, classification of, 293 f.
 in Greek and Latin, Horton-Smith's *Theory* of, noticed, 220 ff.
 confusion of E and I in early capitals, 152a
 " P " T " " 152b, 153b
 Contorniates, the, 238b, 239a
Conway (R. Seymour), notice of Lindsay's *Latin Language*, 403 ff.
 notice of Maurenbrecher's *Carminum Saliarium Reliquiae*, 332
Conybeare (F. C.), notice of Hardy's *Christianity and the Roman Government*, 129
 notice of Harnack's *Inscription of Abercius*, 295 ff.
 on the reading of Acts (i. 18) in Papias, 258
Cook (Arthur Bernard), on the Thymele in Greek Theatres, 370 ff.
 Cooper's *Word-Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius*, noticed, 462 f.
Corpus Poetarum Latinorum, Postgate's ed. of the, noticed, 322 ff.
 Corrections in the Florence MS. of Nonius, 396 ff., 447 ff.
Coupe (Charles, S. J.), note on the Homeric diaeresis, 311
 Crete, discoveries in, 140a, b, 187b, 188a
 Critical notes on Clement of Alexandria's *Stromateis*, 97 ff., 202 ff., 297 ff., 337 ff., 385 ff., 433 ff.
 Crusius' *Die Delphischen Hymnen*, noticed, 177 f.
Cult of Asclepius, Walton's, noticed, 138
 Curtius, a borrower from Thucydides, 478a, b
 Curtius (G.) on *Tempuslehre*, 145b, 291b
 Curtius-Hartel on *Tempuslehre*, 291b, 343a (n.)
 Cyzicus, coins of, 334a

D.

- Damsté's *Lectiones Curtianae*, noticed, 230 f.
 Dardanus, coins of, 333b
 Darenth, discovery of Roman villa at, 93a
daucende Handlung (radical idea of present stem), 290b
 Davis' P. *Corneli Taciti Germania*, noticed, 329b
 De Borkowski on the Greek and Slavonic verb, 342b, 344a
 on the Latin perfect, 445b, 446a
 De Mirmont's *Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile*, noticed, 175 ff.
decretum Eutyhiani papae and funeral superstitions, the, 247b, 249b
 'Decurtatus' ('Schidae') and 'Crusellinus,' Bosius' MSS., 241a, 242a, 245b, 246a, b
 Delbrück on *Tempuslehre*, 290a, 292a, 447a, b
 Delos, ancient harbour at, 379b
 French excavations in the theatre at, 471a, b
 Delphi, discoveries at, 93a, b, 187b, 379b, 380a
 Delphic Hymns, Crusius on the, noticed, 177 f.
 Well and Reinach on the second, noticed, 467 ff. (see 427a)

deodand, the law of, 250b
Description Raisonnée du Musée de St. Germain-en-Laye, Reinach's, noticed, 136 ff.
 Descriptive names of animals in Greece, 12 f.
 Diadochi and Alexander, the, 58b, 59a
diatisiktakhoras (Bp. George's letters), note on the word, 311
dieu au maillet, 137b
 **diñus*, orig. form of *Zēús* (Skt. *dyāus*), 116a
 Dimeh in the Fayum, inscription at, 335b
 Dio Cassius, Melber's ed. of, noticed, 367
 Diogenes of Apollonia parodied by Aristophanes, 173a
Dionysos, Navarre's, noticed, 470 ff.
Dispatet, 137a
 divine honours to great men, explanation of, 60a
Dizionario Epigrafico di Antichità Romane, Ruggero's, noticed, 236
 **dōm* (*dōmos*, *domus*), orig. form of *dō* (e.g. *χαλκοβατὴς δῶ*), 116a
Donkin (E. H.), on *ἐκ* or *ἀπὸ* denoting position, 349 f.
Donovan (J.), notice of Sonnenschein's *Greek Grammar*, 60 ff.
 on Greek jussives, 145 ff.
 and German opinion, 289 ff., 342 ff., 444 ff.
D'Ooge (M. L.), notice of Graves' ed. of the *Philoctetes*, 53
 dual (act.), why no first person in, 319b
 Dueros inscription and the Saliar Hymns, date of the, 332b
 'duration' theory, the, 343a
duumviri(*quaesitores*), 5a

E.

ear of wheat as coin-type, the, 333b
Earle (Mortimer Lamson), *Miscellanea Critica*, 439 ff.
 note on Soph. *Ant.* (117-120), 15
 notes on Euripides *Phoenissae*, 13 f.
 notes on Soph. *Trach.* (56) and Eur. *Med.* (13), 395 f.
 on Soph. *Trach.* (26-48)—a study in interpretation, 200 ff.
 Earle's ed. of the *Alkestis*, noticed, 51 f.
 Egypt, inscription from, 335b
 Revenue papyrus from, *ib.*
 Egyptian MSS., division of words at the end of lines in, 466b
 origin of the Eleusinian mysteries, 473 f.
 scribes, attribution to of all the great uncial Bible MSS., 466b
 -ε- confused with -η or -π, 313b
 εἰ δ' ἔγε, note on, 18
εἰσπρέτον, 292 f.
 G. Curtius on, 292b
ἐκ or *ἀπὸ* denoting position, note on, 349 f.
 the 'surveying' use of, 349a
 Eleusinia and Thesmophoria, origin of the, 473b
 Eleusinian mysteries, Foucart on the, noticed, 473 f.
 (see 428 b)
 Eleusis, terracotta plaque at, 335b
 tomb discovery at, 428b
 Elizabethan composers, 427a
Ellershaw (H.), notice of Page's ed. of the *Aeneid* (I-vi.), 53 f.
Ellis (Robinson), notice of Hilberg *On the Ovidian Pentameter*, 157 ff.
 notice of Lafaye's *Catulle et ses modèles*, 39 ff.
 notice of Madan's *Catalogue of Western MSS. in the Bodleian*, 367 ff.
 some emendations of the Greek Tragici, 105 f.
 three geographical notes on Propertius, 443 f.

Elymi, origin of the, 218b
Emendations in Aecchylus, etc., Rogers', noticed, 362 f.
 of the Greek Tragici, 105 f.
England (E. B.), notice of Earle's ed. of the *Alkestis*, 51 f.
 notice of Hadley's ed. of the *Hecuba*, 170 ff.
 epic poem, desiderata in an, 176a
 Epictetus, Bodleian MS. of and Schenkl's collation, 37 ff.
 Schenkl's ed. of, noticed, 31 ff.
 Upton's codex of, 36 f., 232a, 235b
 Epidauros, discovery of statue at, 93a
 excavation of stadium at, 335b
 theatre at, 134 f.
 epirrhematic nature of comedy, the, 172b
 equites, status of the, 224a
 Eretria, discoveries at, 379b
 the theatre at, 379b, 471b
 Erinyes of a murdered person, the, 279b
 Etruscans, origin of the, 219b
Eudemian Ethics, the title, 2b (n.)
 Euripides a religious reformer, 408a
 Alkestis, Earle's ed. of, noticed, 51 f.
 parallelism between and the *Antigone*, 440b
 'racialization' of, 408 ff.
Bacchae, compared with the mediaeval mysteries, 227a, 228a
 religious object in, 225 ff.
 the person of Cadmus in, 227b
 of Teiresias, 226 f.
 depreciation of since Schlegel, 408a
Hecuba, Hadley's ed. of, noticed, 170 ff.
Ion, underlying plot of, 412b
Iphigenia in Tauris, underlying plot of, *ib.*
Medea (13), note on, 396
 merits of, 413b
Phoenissae, notes on, 13 f.
Rhesus, the chorus in, 135b
 the *Rationalist*, Verrall's, noticed, 407 ff.
 even (evening), etymology of, 189a
everriatores, 248a
 evolution (*Entwicklung*) in the present stem, 343a
 (and n.), 344b, 445a, b
 eye as coin-type, the, 334b

F.

Fabius, trial of, 8a
facere patrimonium, 348a
 Falerii, Juno-festival at, 475b
familia Gallicana of Ciceronian MSS. (*Epp. ad Att.*), 241a, 242a, b
 Farrar on the pres. and aor. in Greek jussives, 145b
 feeding horse as coin-type of Neandria, the, 333b
 fir-tree as coin-type, the, 334a
 Flaminica Dialis, the—was she priestess of Juno (?), 474 ff.
 'Flavian policy' towards the Christians, the, 129a, b
 Florence MS. of Nonius, corrections in the, 396 ff., 447 ff.
 Forbes' *Thucydides* (Book i.), noticed, 360 ff.
 Foucart's *Recherches sur l'Origine et la Nature des Mystères d'Eleusis*, noticed, 473 f.
 Fournier (Marcel) on the *provocatio*, 4b, 7b
Fowler (W. Warde), on the Flaminica Dialis, 474 ff.
Fragments of the Greek Tragedians, Blaydes', noticed, 49 f.
 Freese's transl. of the *Orations of Isocrates*, noticed, 125 f.
 Friedrich's *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Philologische Untersuchungen*, noticed, 130 ff.

- fulfilled and unfulfilled conditions, 294a
 funeral superstitions, 247 ff.
Furneaux (H.), notice of Bennett's ed. of the *Dialogus* of Tacitus, 48 f.
 notice of Gudeman's ed. of the *Dialogus* of Tacitus, 44 ff.
Furneaux' Cornelii Taciti de Germania, noticed, 326 ff.
Furtwängler (A.), on the Lemnia of Pheidias and the Parthenon Sculptures, 269 ff.
 Furtwängler's views on the Parthenon marbles criticized, 85 ff.
- G.
- galea* (*galeazza*), 266b
 Gallo-Roman art, 137 f.
 Gauls, old tribal feeling among the, 442b
 prejudice against their admission into the senate, *ib.*
γῆρυς, Skt. *jāyāna* (**γῆρυς*, Skt. *jāyāna* 117a
Gehring's Index Homericus, noticed, 415 ff.
 principal faults of, 415b, 416a
 genitive, Streitberg's theory of the, 116b
 geographical notes on Propertius, 443 f.
 George's (Bishop) Letters, 311a
 Gergis, coin-type of, 333b
 German funeral superstitions, 247 ff.
 opinion on Greek jussives, 289 ff., 342 ff., 444 ff.
 Germani (*gair* = clamare), 327b
 Gevaert on Greek music, 469b, 470a
gi-la-du, 216a
 notice of Smyth's *Ionic Dialect*, 457 ff.
Giles (P.), notice of Smyth's *Ionic Dialect*, 457 ff.
 notice of Streitberg's *Die Entstehung der Dehnstufe*, 115 ff.
 Goddess of Victory, Baudrillart's treatise on the, noticed, 187
 gods as married couples, tendency at Rome to group (?), 474 ff.
 Goethe on Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield*, 11b
 Goldbacher on *Tempuslehre*, 292a (n.), 343a (n.)
 Goldsmith's prognostic of fame, 11b
 Goodwin on the present and aorist in Greek jussives, 145b
 on the present stem, 344b, 345a (n.)
 Gottwei MS. of Cornelius Nepos, 140b
 **gḗyos*, orig. form of *Bois* (Skt. *gāus*), 116a
Gow (James), *Horatiana*, 302 ff.
 Goyau's ed. of Cagnat's *Roman Antiquities*, noticed, 229
Grammatici Graeci (part. iv. vol. 2), Hilgard's, noticed, 317 ff.
 grape-bunch as coin-type, the, 333b
 Graves' (C. E.) *The Wasps* of Aristophanes, noticed, 121 ff.
 Graves' (F. P.) *The Philoctetes* of Sophocles, noticed, 53
 Greece, policy of Rome towards (196-146 B.C.), 59b
 Greek burial laws and folklore, 247 ff.
 coins acquired by the British Museum in 1894, 380a
 descriptive animal names, 12 f.
 Grammar, Sonnenschein's, noticed, 60 ff.
 History, Holm's, noticed, 57 ff.
 proper limits of, 57b, 58a
 jussives, Donovan on, 145 ff.
 German opinion on, 289 ff., 342 ff., 444 ff.
 mythology, Aryan hypothesis of, 67b
 Oriental „ 67 ff.
 Pelasgic „ 70a
 palaeography, Wattenbach on, noticed, 465 f.
 stage, Christ on the, noticed, 133 ff.
- Greek states, development of in the third century, 59b
Studies, Pater's, noticed, 225 ff.
 theatre, Navarre on the, noticed, 470 ff.
Tragic Poets, Roger's *Emendations in the*, etc., noticed, 362 f.
 Tragici, some emendations of the, 105 f.
 Gregorian music, 425a, 427a
Greenidge (A. H. J.), notice of Zoeller's Roman Constitutional Law, 223 f.
 on the procedure of the *provocatio*, 4 ff.
 on the title *quaestor pro praetore*, 258 f.
 Grynium, coin-type of, 334a
Gudeman (Alfred), obituary notice of Dr. A. C. Merriam, 189 ff.
 Gudeman's *P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de Oratoribus*, noticed, 44 ff.
- H.
- Hadley's *The Hecuba* of Euripides, noticed, 170 ff.
Haigh (A. E.), notice of Navarre's *Dionysos*, 470 ff.
 Haigh and Papillon's *P. Vergili Maronis opera omnia* [The Oxford Text of Virgil], noticed, 366 f.
han (Vedic Sanskrit), 18b
 Hardy's *Christianity and the Roman Government*, noticed, 129
 Hardknot fragment and coins, the, 311a
 Harmodius and Aristogeiton's descendants, privileges of, 72a
 Harnack's *Zur Abercius-Inschrift*, noticed, 295 ff.
Harrington (Karl P.), note on Tibullus (i. 1, 1-2), 108 f. (see *Cl. Rev.* viii. 198b)
Harrison (Jane E.), criticism of Furtwängler's views on the Parthenon marbles, 85 ff.
 [Furtwängler's reply to, 272 ff.]
 notice of Baudrillart's treatise on the Goddess of Victory, 187
 notice of Walton's 'Cult of Asklepios' [*Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*], 138
 on the Central Group of the East Frieze of the Parthenon—*peplos* or *στροφμή*? 427 f.
 Hartland's *The Legend of Perseus*, noticed, 78
 Hatzidakis (Prof.) on tenses in Mod. Greek, 446, (and n.)
 on Slavonic and Greek, 444a, b
 Hauvette's *Hérodote, historien des guerres Médiques*, noticed, 169 f.
Haverfield (F.), note on Tacitus *Agrie*. (24), 310 f.
 notice of Ruggiero's *Dizionario Epigrafico*, 236
 notice of Wachsmuth's *Introduction to the Study of Ancient History*, 466 f.
Hayley (H. W.), notice of Cooper's *Word-Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius*, 462 f.
Headlam (Arthur C.), notice of the anonymous *Oracles ascribed to Matthew by Papias of Hierapolis*, 419 f.
Hecale, Ovid's indebtedness to the, 477a
 Hecate of Hesiod, Warr on the, 390 ff.
 parentage of, 391b
 Perseis, 392a
 Heimdal, the Norse, 137a
 Heindenburg (Pfalz), excavations on the, 187b
 Heine and Euripides, 409b
Heitland (W. E.), notes on the text of Lucan, 8 ff., 149 ff., 193 ff.
 Hellenic Society, address to by the President on Sir C. T. Newton, 81 ff.
 Hellenistic, 'the barbarous word', 58b
 hendecasyllable, the Roman, 39b, 40b
 Heracles originally a Semitic god (?), 69b
 Hermann on *Tempuslehre*, 290b, 291a (n.)
 Hermes (Merodach, 69b, 70a
 originally a wind-god (?), 414b

- Herodas, date of, 140a
 Herodotus, date of his birth, 169b
 Hauvette on, noticed, 169 f.
 his relations to the Persian authorities, 170a
 trustworthiness and Niebuhr, *ib.*
 the λόγοι bases of his history, 170b
 Hesiodic Hecate, the—a criticism of Hesiod *Theog.* (411–452), 390 ff.
 Nike, the, 281a
 Hessel (S. of Philae), inscription at, 237b
 Hicks (R. D.), notice of Waddell's ed. of the *Parthenides*, 312 ff.
 Hicks and Susemihl's ed. of the *Politics* (Books i.–iv.), noticed, 454 ff.
 'hidden quantities,' 404b
 Higgins (L. R.), on the meaning of βούλομαι in Homer, 393 ff.
 Hilberg's *Gesetze der Wortstellung im Pentameter des Ovid*, noticed, 157 ff.
 Hilgard's *Grammatici Graeci* (part iv. vol. 2), noticed, 317 ff.
 Hill (G. F.), *Monthly Record*, 93, 138 ff., 187 f., 237 f., 283 f.
 notice of Jones' *Select Passages on Greek Sculpture*, 236 f.
 on descriptive names of animals in Greece [see *Cl. Rev.* viii. 381 ff.], 12 f.
 Hilprecht's *Assyria, Eine Nachlese auf dem Gebiete der Assyriologie*, noticed, 215 ff.
 hipid (hipust), 461b
 Hirtzel (F. Arthur), notice of Holden's ed. of Plutarch's *Life of Pericles*, 363 ff.
 notice of Kock's ed. of the *Clouds* of Aristophanes, 172 ff.
 Hissarlik as the site of the Homeric Troy, 94b
 Hoess' *De ubertate et abundantia sermonis Isocratei observationum capita selecta*, noticed, 126 f.
 Holden's *Plutarch's Life of Pericles*, noticed, 363 ff.
 Holder's *Scholium Antiqua in Q. Horatium Flaccum* (vol. i.), noticed, 129 f.
 Holm's *Griechische Geschichte von ihrem Ursprunge bis zum Untergange der Selbständigkeit des griechischen Volkes*, vol. iv. (also vol. i. of English translation), noticed, 57 ff.
 Homer *Iliad*, constitution of the original poem, 430a
 Odyssey and Trapani, 56 f.
 Butler's pamphlets on, *ib.*
 Homeric armour, Reichel on the, noticed, 55 f.
 breastplate, the, 55b, 56
 no mention of in the *Odyssey* or *Dolonia*, 55b
 its interpolation, date of, 56a
 criticism, Cauer on the groundwork of, noticed, 463 ff.
 diaeresis, Monro's definition of the, 311a
 note on the, 311
 dialect, relation of to late Ionic, 459a
 hymns, Gehring's *Index* to the, noticed, 415 ff.
 shield, the, 55a
 ship, the, 266a
 use of βούλομαι, 393 ff.
 Hopkins (A. G.), note on Plautus *Trinummus* (642 sqq.), 307 ff.
 hora synonymous with tempus, 259b
 Horace *Od.* i.–iii., date of, 302b, 303a
 iv. (2, 49), note on, 110
 sapphic metre of, 141b, 142a
 The Historical and Political Odes, Church's, noticed, 267
 Horatiana, 302 ff.
 Horatius, trial of, 4b, 7a
 Hort (F. J. A.), emendations on the *Stromateis* (Book vii.) of Clement of Alexandria, 385 ff., 433 ff.
 Horton-Smith's tense-divisions, 342a, b
 The Theory of Conditional Sentences in Greek and Latin, noticed, 220 ff.
 'Hottentot Latin,' 332a
 Housesteads, the fortress of, 236a
 Housman (A. E.), notice of Postgate's ed. of Propertius, 350 ff.
 on the MSS. of Propertius, 19 ff.
 Howard (H. F.), note on Horace *Od.* (iv. 2, 49), 110
 Hultsch's *Die erzählenden Zeitformen bei Polybios, ein Beitrag zur Syntax der gemeingriechischen Sprache*, noticed, 127 f.
 views on *Tempuslehre*, 343b
 Hume and Adam Smith, mannerisms of, 458b
 Hymn to Apollo, 'systems' of the, 421 ff.
 'Hymns of the Antonines,' 421a, 426b
 Hyperides, Blass' ed. of, noticed, 73 f.
 Kenyon's ed. of, noticed, 71 ff.
 papyrus of in the Louvre, 71a
 Raphael fragments of, 73a
 speech against Athenogenes (δικη βλάβης), 71a, b
 against Philippides (γραφὴ παρανόμων), 71b, 72a
 Tancock fragments of, 73a
 Isteron proteron, Page's view of [see *Cl. Rev.* viii. 203 f.], 54b

I. J.

i [ei] : 191 : : es : 1-σ-θι, 18b

Jachin and Boas, 68b

Jackson (Henry), suggestions on the *Politics* of Aristotle, 455b, 456b
 on the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria, 97a, b (n.)Jackson (T. W.), notice of Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, 322 ff.

iambus, the Roman, 40a

Jamot and Furtwängler on the Athenian Lemnia, 269 ff.

Janiform head as coin-type, 334a

Ianus Quirini (Hor. *Od.* iv. 15, 9), ἀπ. λεγ., 267b

Iapygians and Messapians, the 218b, 219a

Jeans (G. E.), notice of Tyrrell and Purser's *Letters of Cicero* (vol. iv.), 42 ff.

Jebb (R. C.), address to the Hellenic Society on Sir C. T. Newton, 81 ff.

Jevons (F. B.), notice of Hartland's *Legend of Perseus*, 78

on Greek burial laws and folklore, 247 ff.

Ihering on the *provocatio*, 5a

IHS on Thibetan coins, 334b

Ilium, coins of, 333b

Novum, coins of, *ib.*

Imhotep, the Egyptian, 137a

immunis, 302a, b

imperium (magistratus), 259b

of the Princes, 224a

of the provinces and the city, 259b

In Memoriam Caroli Thomae Newton, 85

ina libbi, 216a

independent editorship, the *pros* and *cons.* of, 170a, b

Index Homericus, Gehring's, noticed, 415 ff.

infinitive mood, the, 321a, b

imperative function of, *ib.*

inrogare (iudicare), 6b

Inscription of Albercius, Harnack on the, noticed, 295 ff.

intercalation in the Attic year, note on, 30 f.

- Introduction to Greek Palaeography*, Wattenbach's, noticed, 465 f.
Introduction to the Study of Ancient History, Wachsmuth's, noticed, 466 f.
 Iobacchoi inscription and the feast of the *σσιβας*, the, 427b
 Johannes Tornaesius (Jean de Tournes), 247a, b
 John (St.), identity of authorship of the Gospel and First Epistle, 420a
 the Presbyter and the Apostle John, 419b
 Jones' *Select Passages from Ancient Writers illustrative of the History of Greek Sculpture*, noticed, 236 f.
Ionic Dialect, Smyth's, noticed, 457 ff.
 Ionisms of Attic tragedy, the, 459a
 Josephus on the locality of Tarshish, 476b
 Irenaeus and Eusebius, 254b
 and Polycarp, 253 f.
 birthplace of (?), 254a (n.)
 inaccuracies of, 254 ff.
 letter of to Florinus, 253 f.
 on Christ's age, 256 f.
 Isis and Osiris, introduction of cult of into Greece (?), 473a, b
 Isocrates, authenticity of *Ad Demonicum* and *Letters*, 127b
 Freese's transl. of, noticed, 125 f.
 Hoess on the style of, noticed, 126 f.
 papyrus of Marseilles, date of, 466a
 use of synonyms, 126 f.
 whence theory of dating his speeches, 127b
 'Itali' and the text of Propertius, the, 323a
 Italia, the name, 219a
 Italy and Greece, ancient communications between, 219b
 and Sicily, Greek cities in, 219a
 earliest inhabitants of, 218b
iudicia populi(*provocatio*), 5 ff.
 Iulis (Ceos), funeral law of, 247 ff.
 Julius Florus and the rebellion of Sacrovir, 442b
Jupiter à la roue, 137b
jus honorum, admission of foreigners to, 441a, b
 jussives, Greek, 145 ff.
 German opinion on, 289 ff., 342 ff., 444 ff.
 Juvenal, notes on, 346 ff.
 (vii. 165), note on, 29 f.
 Ixion myth, Cecil Smith on the, 277 ff.

K.

- Kaegi on *Tempuslehre*, 291b, 343a (n.)
 Kalauria, excavations in, 139b, 140a
 Kallimachus, date of, 276b
 Kara-Enyuk (near Caesarea), cuneiform inscriptions at, 93b
 Kassite (or Kossnean) kings, 216b
Kenyon (F. G.), notice of Wattenbach's *Introduction to Greek Palaeography*, 465 f.
 Kenyon's *Hyperides*, the *Orationes against Athenogenes* and *Philippides*, noticed, 71 ff.
 kinsman (*μυφóλιος árhv*), slaying of a, 278b
 Koch on *Tempuslehre*, 290b, 293b, 342 f.
 Koch's *Claudii Claudiani carmina*, noticed, 168 f.
 Koch's *Ausgewählte Komödien des Aristophanes*, noticed, 172 ff.
 Kruger (*δ γράμματικώτατος*) on *Tempuslehre*, 291b, 292b
 Kühner on *Tempuslehre*, 290b, 291a

L.

- Lafaye's *Cutelle et ses modèles*, noticed, 39 ff.

- Lambinus and Bosius, 245b, 246a
 Lanciani's ed. of Ramsay's *Roman Antiquities*, noticed, 230
laticlavii, 442a
Latin and Greek Verse Translations, Baker's, noticed, 369 f.
Language, Lindsay's, noticed, 403 ff.
 orthography, 130b
 in the new *Corpus*, 130b. (n.), 322a, b
 of Nonius Marcellus, 357a
Leaf (Walter), notice of Causer's *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*, 463 ff.
 notice of Reichel's *Ueber Homerische Waffen*, 55 ff.
Lectiones Curtianae, Damaté's, noticed, 230 f.
Legend of Perscus, Hartland's, noticed, 78
 Legions I. Minervia and XXX. Ulpia, Schilling on the, noticed, 186
 Lehmann and Cicero's *Letters to Atticus*, 242a, 246b
 Lemnia of Pheidias and the Parthenon Sculptures, Furtwängler on the, 269 ff.
 helmetless, the, 271b
 identical with Athene as described by Himerius, *ib.*
Lendrum (W. T.), on a parallel between Milton and Pindar [see *Cl. Rev.* viii. 349], 10 f.
 Lesbos, coins of, 334b, 335a
lex curiata de imperio, the, 224b
 lexicons and editions, distinction between, 415b
 Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays* (pp. 55-64), notes on some passages in, 253 ff.
Lindsay (W. M.), notice of Onions' ed. of Nonius Marcellus, 356 ff. (see 396 ff., 447 ff.)
 on Schenkl's collation of the Bodleian MS. of Epictetus (book i.), 37 ff.
 Lindsay's *The Latin Language, an Historical Account of Latin Sounds, Stems, and Flexions*, noticed, 403 ff.
Lock (Walter), on the use of *περιπέτεια* in Aristotle's *Poetics*, 251 ff.
 Lua Saturni, 475b
 Lucan, notes on the text of, 8 ff., 149 ff., 193 ff.
 Lucian and Euripides, 410a
 Lucilius i. 24 [30], note on, 30
 Lucretius (iii. 962), note on, 156
 bracketed lines in, 207 ff.
 Brieger's ed. of, noticed, *ib.*
 illustrated by George Sand, 208a
 lacunae in, 207a
 transpositions in, 207b, 208b, 210a
 Lycurgus and the Athenian Theatre, 134b, 472a, b
 Lysis, date of the, 477b

M.

- Mackail (J. W.)**, notice of Stadtmüller's ed. of the *Palatine Anthology*, 261 f.
 Madan's *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, noticed, 367 ff.
magistratus(*imperium*), 259b
 Magna Graecia, earliest date of the term, 219b, 220a
 equivalent to our 'Greater Britain,' 220a
 Magnesia inscription and the 'peplos theory,' 91b
 the *στροφάλυγες* of the, 274b, 427b
 Maia Volcani, 475b
Marchant (E. C.), note on Thuc. (vi. 11, 2-3), 309 f.
 notice of Forbes' ed. of Thucydides (book i.), 360 ff.
 Marchant's ed. of Thucydides (book vii.), noticed, 262 f.
Marindin (G. E.), on the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, 467a

Mark Antony, coins of, 266a
ships of at Actium, 265b
Marsala, inscription at, 237b
Martyrdom of Polycarp, genuineness of the, 419a, 420b
Masson (J.), notice of Brieger's ed. of Lucretius, 207 ff.
Matthew (xi. 19), note on, 312
Maurenbrecher's *Carminum Saliarium Reliquiae*, noticed, 332
Mausoleum of Halicarnassus and Sir C. T. Newton, the, 82b, 83a
maximus (maximus), 404b
Mayence, Roman votive altars at, 335a
Mayor (J. B.), critical notes on the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria, 97 ff., 202 ff., 297 ff., 337 ff., 385 ff., 433 ff.
notice of Schenkl's ed. of Epictetus, 31 ff.
rejoinder to author's reply, 234 f.
meddiz (Oscan), 406b
Melampus, origin of the name, 12b, 13a
Melber's *Dionis Cassii Cocciani Historia Romana*, noticed, 367
Mendelssohn on the Cluny MS. and Bosiani codices, 242a
Menenius, trial of, 7b
Merkel on the *provocatio*, 4a
Merriam (Dr. A. C.), obituary notice of, 189 ff.
Merry (W. W.) note on Juvenal (vii. 165), 29 f.
Merry's ed. of the *Wasps*, noticed, 117 ff.
Mesomedes, attribution to of the hymn to Nemesis, 470a
Messapian inscription at Rubi, the, 219a
Messapians and Iapygians, the, 218b, 219a
meteorological school of mythologists, the, 414a
metrical exigency in tense-choice, 345b
Miles (E. H.), on the *ei* of *ei δ' ἄγε*, 18
Milton and Pindar, literary parallels between, 10 ff.
Minderud, 404a
Miscellanea Critica, 439 ff.
Modes of Ancient Greek Music, author's reply to notice of [see *Cl. Rev.* viii. 448 ff.], 79 ff.
momentane *Handlung* (radical idea of aorist stem), 290b
replaced by *eintretende Handlung*, 291b
'momentary,' meaning of the word, 447b (n.)
momentum and punctum, notes on, 259 f.
Mommson on the *Augusti tropaea*, 303b, 304a
on the *provocatio*, 4a
Monro (D. B.), notice of Weil and Reinach's *Un nouvel hymne à Apollon*, 467 ff.
reply to reviewer's notice of *The Modes of Ancient Greek Music*, 79 ff.
Montemarciano (Umbria), coin-find at, 139a
Montepulciano (Etruria), sepulchral chamber at, *ib.*
Monthly Record, 93, 138 ff., 187 f., 237 f., 283 f., 335, 379 f., 428 f.
moods, precedence of the, 321b
mortis lacrimis (Prop.), 106a
Mowat (the late J. L. G.) and the Bodleian codex of Epictetus, 31, 232b, 233a, 234 f.
Moxley (J. R.), notice of Verrall's *Euripides the Rationalist*, 407 ff.
MSS. antiquity of, how far a criterion? 23a, 182b, 183a
in the Bodleian, Catalogue of Western, 367 ff.
of Apuleius, 478b
Bosius, the fictitious, 241 ff.
Cicero, 42b, 241 ff.
Claudian, 165 ff.
Hyperides, 71a, 73a, 466a
Lucan, 8, 9a
Nonius Marcellus, 356 f.
Ovid, 157a, 159a, b, 160a, 162a

MSS. of Plato, 312a, b
Propertius, 19 ff., 178 ff., 322b, 323a
Tacitus (*Dialogus*), 46a
Tibullus, 74a
Müller's (A.), view of the raised stage, 52b
multae, 6b, 7a, 8a
Mulvany (C. M.), on the enclitic *ne*, 15 ff.
Munro and Lucretius, 207 ff.
musical degrees, requirements for, 425b (n.)
Mycenaean groundwork of the Homeric Epos, 463b, 464a
its development traced by the iron test, 464a, b
by the mention of temples, 464b
monuments and the Homeric armour, 55 f.
myth of Ixion, the, 277 ff.
of Meleager, 89b

N.

Naber's theory of the *διασκευή* of the *Clouds*, 173a
Nachschreier, 248a, 249a
Nauck as a critic, 212 f.
Nauck-Schneidewin's edd. of the *Trachiniae* and *Electra*, noticed, 211 ff.
**nāyos*, orig. form of *ναῦς*, 116a
Navarre's *Dionysos: étude sur l'organisation matérielle du théâtre Athénien*, noticed, 470 ff.
views and Dörpfeld's on the Greek stage, 471a, b
on the ancient stone theatre at Athens, 472a, b
ne (enclitic), notes on, 15 ff.
negro's head as coin-type, 334b
Nepos (Cornelius), Gottwei MS. of, 140b
Nerio Martis, 475b
Neuss (Novaesium), discoveries at, 379b
Newman's ed. of Aristotle's *Politics*, 454b, 455a
Newton (Sir C. T.), address on by Prof. Jebb, 81 ff.
compared with Winckelmann, 84b
In *Memorian* verses to, 85
Ruskin on, 82a
Nicklin (T.), note on intercalation in the Attic year, 30 f.
Nike an abstraction from Zeus, 282a
and Athena Nike, Sikes on, 280 ff.
Victoria, 187a
Apteros, 187a, b, 282 f.
of Archermos, 282b
on coins, 281 f.
origin of connexion with Athena, 282 f.
originally connected with music and the games, 281b
the Hesiodean, 281a
Nonius Marcellus, corrections in the Florence MS. of, 396 ff., 447 ff.
MSS. of, 356 f.
their history, 357b, 358
Onions' ed. of, noticed, 356 ff.
orthography of, 357a
Notes on the text of Lucan, 8 ff., 149 ff., 193 ff.
nova Augusti tropaea (Hor. Od. ii. 9, 18 sq.), 303a, b

O.

ὀβελοί dedicated as money, 334b
Obituary notice :—
Augustus Chapman Merriam, 189 ff.
Oertel (Hanns), notice of Buck's *Oscan-Umbrian Verb-System*, 460 f.
Old Testament quotations in the Early Church, 420b
Olympus and Terpander and the *τρόπος σπονδειακός*, 424b

- Onions' *Nonius Marcellus de Conpendiosa Doctrina* (i. iii.), noticed, 356 ff.
- Ophrynum, coin-type of, 333b
- ὄψις (= 'stage-scenery'), 301a
- optative, functions of the, 321b
- Oracles ascribed to Matthew by Papias of Hierapolis, the anonymous, noticed, 419 f.
- Orestes of Euripides, fragment of the music of, 469b
- Oriental hypothesis of Greek mythology, the, 67 ff.
- orthography, Latin, 130b, 322a, b, 357a
- Oscan-Umbrian Verb-System, Buck's, noticed, 460 f.
- Osiris and Isis, cult of introduced into Greece (?), 473a, b
- Ovid *Ibis*, interpolations in, 158b (n.)
its place among the poet's writings, *ib.*
indebtedness of to the *Hecale*, 477a
modern edd. of, 157a
- Ovidian Pentameter, Hilberg on the, noticed, 157 ff.
- Owen (S. G.), notice of Papillon and Haigh's *Text of Virgil*, 366 f.
notice of Wilkins' ed. of the *Catiline Orations*, 263 ff.
on some passages of Juvenal, 346 ff.
on Statius *Silv.* (i. 6, 44), 81
- Oxford Text of Virgil, Papillon and Haigh's, noticed, 366 f.
- oyster (or mussel) as coin-type, 334a
- P.
- Page (T. E.), notice of Holder's *Scholia Antiqua in Q. Horatium Flaccum* and Friedrich's *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Philologische Untersuchungen*, 129 ff.
- Page's *The Aeneid of Virgil* (i. vi.), noticed, 53 f.
view of the so-called *ὄρερον πρότερον*, 54b
- Pais' *Storia della Sicilia e della Magna Graecia*, noticed, 217 ff.
- Palatine Anthology, Stadtmüller's ed. of the, noticed, 261 f.
- Pan a sun-god (?), 70, 90b
- Panticapaeum, coin-type of, 273b (n.)
- Papias and St. John, 254b, 256b, 419b, 420a
and the reading of Acts (i. 18), 258
ascription of oracles to St. Matthew, 419 f.
date of, *ib.*
- Papillon and Haigh's *Vergili Maronis opera omnia* [The Oxford Text of Virgil], noticed, 366 f.
- Parthenon Marbles, Furtwängler's views on the, criticized, 85 ff.
as regards the East frieze central group, 91 f., 427, f.: see 274 ff.
as regards the East pediment, 88 ff.: see 273
the West pediment 86 ff.: see 272 f.
- participles, how far indicative of time, 445a, b
- **páteros*, orig. form of *πατήρ*, 116a
- Pater's *Greek Studies*, noticed, 225 ff.
- Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthums-wissenschaft*, Wissowa's ed. of, noticed, 113 f.
- Pausanias and the *xporind* of Apollodorus, 478b
- Pelagic hypothesis of Greek mythology, 70a
- Pelham (H. F.), on the Emperor Claudius and the chiefs of the Aedui, 441 ff.
- Pelignian inscription, recent discovery of a, 332b
- Pericles and Aspasia, 364b
attack of on the Areopagus, 108a, b
character of, 364b
- περίερεα, Aristotle's use of in the *Poetics*, 251 ff.
illustrations of, 252a
renderings of, 251a
- peplos or *σπαρμή* in the central group of the East frieze of the Parthenon? 427 f.: see 274 f.
theory criticized, the, 91 f.: see 274 f.
- Perseis(Hecate Perseis, 392a
- Perseus (Perseus), myths connected with, 391b, 392a
- Perseus, The Legend of*, Hartland's, noticed, 78
- Peterson (W.), notice of Davis' ed. of Tacitus *Germania*, 329b
notice of Furneaux' ed. of Tacitus *Germania*, 326 ff.
notice of Stephenson's ed. of Tacitus *Agricola* and *Germania*, 329b, 330
- Phillimore (J. S.), note on Statius *Silv.* (i. 6, 44), 81
- Philodemus, Sudhaus' ed. of, noticed, 358 f.
treatises of discovered at Herculaneum (1752), 358a
- Phoenicians in Arcadia, Bérard on the, noticed, 67 ff.
- Pindar and Milton, literary parallels between, 10 ff.
and Wordsworth, compared, 11
- Pisistratus' ἀρχαί, dates of, 106 f.
- Platner (Samuel Ball), note on Lucilius i. 24 [30], 30
notes on *punctum* and *momentum*, 259 f.
- Plato *Parmenides*, authorship of, 315a, b
Schaarschmidt on the, 317a
Socher on the, 315b
design of, 315b, 316a
Grote on the, *ib.*
Schleiermacher on the, 315b
its period of Plato's authorship, 315b, 316a
Waddell's ed. of, noticed, 312 ff.
- Protagoras*, Sihler's ed. of, noticed, 174 f.
- Platt (Arthur), notice of Butler's pamphlets on the *Odyssey*, 56 f.
- Plautus *Trinummus* (642 sqq.), note on, 307 ff.
- Plotius Gallus, the rhetorician, 476b
- 'plusquamperfectische Aorist,' the, 445b
- Plutarch *Life of Pericles*, Holden's ed. of, noticed, 363 ff.
- porcum*, *porchicum* (but *corculum*, *porculus*, etc.) in Plautus, 404a
- **pódos* (**pédos*), orig. form of *πόδις* (Lat. *pes*), 115b
- Pollux and the Greek Theatre, 471b
- Polybius, foremost of writers of the *κονή*, 127b
Hultsch on the Tenses of, noticed, 127 f.
- Pompeii, excavations at, 93a
- Pompeius Trogus, *Universal History* of, 60a
- Pompey, character of, 124b
- pondus* (Quint. xiii. 10, 7), meaning of, 237a
- Postgate (J. P.), notice of Belling's pamphlets on Tibullus, 74 ff.
notice of Birt's and Koch's edd. of Claudian, 162 ff.
on the MSS. of Propertius—a disclaimer, 133;
a reply, 178 ff.
- Postgate's ed. of the *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum* (tom. i., fasc. ii.), noticed, 322 ff.
- Sexti Properti Carmina*, noticed, 350 ff.
- Prasiae, excavations at the necropolis of, 93a
- present, aorist, and future stems—all *zeillos*, 239b
- πρῶν, construction of, 63a
Goodwin's view of, *ib.* (n.)
- πρῶν ἔν with pres. subj., Shilleto on, 445a (n.)
- Princeps, *imperium* of the, 224a
- Propertius, Postgate's ed. of, noticed, 350 ff.
text of, 323a, b
transpositions in, 324 f., 354 f.
the MSS. of, 19 ff., 178 ff., 355b
three geographical notes on, 443 f.
pro praetore applied to the *legati*, 258 b
to the *quaestor*, 253 f.
- πρὸς (with gen. and dat.), 88b, 276a, b
- provocatio*, procedure of the, 4 ff.
- Ptolemy I. (Soter) and the *κονὸν* of Delos, 60b
- II. (Philadelphus) and Theocritus (*Id.* xvii.), 60a
influence of at Athens, 59a, b
- Ptolemy's scheme of modes, 80a

punctum and *momentum*, notes on, 259 f.

Purser (L. C.), notice of Church's *Historical and Political Odes of Horace*, 267

notice of Schilling's *De legionibus Romanorum I. Minervia et XXX. Ulpia*, 186

notice of Strachan-Davidson's *Cicero and the Fall of the Roman Republic*, 123 ff.

Purser and Tyrrell's *Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero* (vol. iv.), noticed, 42 ff.

Pygela, 443 a, b

Pythagoreans and Aristoxenians, the, 425b (n.)

Q.

quaestor pro praetore, the title, 258 f.

quaestoria, 442a

Quatrelle (Venetia), find of Roman weights at, 139a

R.

Rabirius, trial of for *perduellio*, 4b

ragas of the Southern Indians, 427a

Ramsay (G. G.), notice of Reid's ed. of the *Pro Milone*, 330 ff.

Ramsay's (W.) *Manual of Roman Antiquities*, Lanciani's ed. of, noticed, 230

Rawlinson MSS. in the Bodleian, 368a, b

Reichel's *Ueber Homerische Waffen*, noticed, 55 f.

Reid (J. S.), notice of Cagnat's *Roman Antiquities*, 229

notice of Ramsay's *Manual of Roman Antiquities*, 230

Reid's *M. Tulli Ciceronis pro T. Annio Milone ad iudices Oratio*, noticed, 330 ff.

Reinach's *Description Raisonnée du Musée de St. Germain-en-Laye (Bronzes figurés de la Gaule Romaine)*, noticed, 136 ff.

and Weil's *Un nouvel hymne à Apollon*, noticed, 467 ff.

remigium alarum, 265b

Remi on the Pruth, coin-find at, 187b

Richards (Herbert), *Catulliana*, 304 ff.

notice of Butcher's *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, 213 ff.

Ridgeway (William), notice of Torr's *Ancient Ships*, 265 f.

supplementary note to author's reply, 378 f.

notice of Wroth's *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Troas, Aetolis, and Lesbos*, 333 ff.

Riess (E.), on the word *diatrisaktakhoras* (Bishop George's letters), 311

Rogers' *Emendations in Aeschylus, with a few others in Sophocles and Euripides, etc.*, noticed, 362 f.

Roman Antiquities, Cagnat's, noticed, 229

Ramsay's, noticed, 230

Britain, blunders of foreign scholars on, 236

Constitutional Law, Zoeller on, noticed, 223 f.

policy towards Greece (196-146 B.C.), 59b

sermo plebeius, Cooper on the, noticed, 462 f.

tragedy, the chorus in, 135b

Rome, discoveries at, 139a, 379b

root-stems in composition, 116a

Rose (Valentine) and the Bodleian codex of Epictetus, 31

Rovert (Piacenza), explorations in the *terremare* at, 237b

Ruggiero's *Dizionario Epigrafico di Antichità Romane*, noticed, 236

Rushforth (G. McN.), notice of Melber's ed. of Dio Cassius, 367

Rutherford on the pres. and aor. in Greek jussives, 145b

S.

Salar Hymns, Maurenbrecher on the, noticed, 332

sa-man-ti, 216a

Sandys (J. E.), notice of Kenyon's and Blass' ed. of Hyperides, 71 ff.

notice of Sudhaus' ed. of Philodemus, 308 f.

notice of Wissowa's ed. of Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie*, 113 f.

Santo Angelo in Formis, inscription at, 139a

Scamandria, coin-type of, 334a

Scandinavian laws (of Haco), 250b

Scepsis, coins of 333b, 334a

Schenkl's collation of the Bodleian MS. of Epictetus, noticed, 37 ff.

Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae, ad fidem codicis Bodleiani, noticed, 31 ff.

author's reply and reviewer's rejoinder, 231 ff.

Schilling's *De legionibus Romanorum I. Minervia et XXX. Ulpia* [*Leipziger Studien*], noticed, 186

Schmalz on *Tempuschr.*, 292a

Schneidewin-Nauack's edd. of the *Trachiniae* and *Electra*, noticed, 211 ff.

Sclavonic and Greek verb, comparative study of the, 342b, 344a, 444a

Seaton (R. C.), notice of Blake's ed. of the *Hellenica* i. and ii., etc., 231

notice of De Mirmont's *Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile*, 175 ff.

notice of Summers' *Study of the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus*, 111 ff.

Schrwald's *Der Apollonmythus und seine Deutung*, noticed, 413 ff.

Seikelos inscription, the, 470a, b

Select Passages from Ancient Writers illustrative of the History of Greek Sculpture, Jones', noticed, 236 f.

Selections from Strabo, Tozer's, noticed, 268 f.

Selinunte, excavation of temple of, 237b

Sellers (Eugénie), notice of Reinach's *Description Raisonnée du Musée de St. Germain-en-Laye*, 136 ff.

Semitic deities worshipped in trinities, 69

origin of Greek mythology, 67 ff.

senate, modes of admission of foreigners to the Roman, 442a

prejudice against admitting Gauls, 442b

senatorum jus, 441a, b

Serapeum, site of the discovered, 429a

sermo cotidianus, the, 462b

plebeius, definition of the, *ib.*

severi, 224b

Sezze (Setium), *cippus milliarius* at, 428b

Shilleto on *πρὸς ἐν* with pres. subj., 445a (n.)

Shuckburgh (E. S.), notice of Hultsch on the Tenses of Polybius, 127 f.

notice of Pais' *History of Sicily and Magna Graecia*, 217 ff.

sib-ti, 216a

Sicani)(Siceli), 218b

Sidgwick on the pres. and aor. in Greek jussives, 145b, 291a

Sihler (E. G.), notice of Hilgard's *Grammatici Graeci* (part iv. vol. 2), 317 ff.

Sihler's *The Protagoras of Plato*, noticed, 174 f.

Sikes (E. E.), notice of Bérard's *Mythology of Arcadia*, 67 ff.

notice of Foucard's *Eleusinian Mysteries*, 473 f.

notice of Schrwald's *Apollonmythus*, 413 ff.

on Nike and Athena Nike, 280 ff.

Silsilis, Greek inscription at, 237b

sis-sit-ti, 216a

Smith (Cecil), on the myth of Ixion, 277 ff.

Smith (Charles Forster), notice of Marchant's ed. of Thucydides (book vii.), 262 f.

Smyth's *The Sounds and Inflections of the Greek Dialects*: Ionic, noticed, 457 ff.

snake, orig. underworld function of the, 279a (and n.)

socii in Italy, status of the, 224a

- Socrates and Protagoras on ἀρετή, 175*a*, *b*
 Solonian appeal, the, 7*a*
 funeral legislation, 247*a*, 248*b*
 borrowed by the Boeotians and in the XII.
 Tables (?), 247*a*
 in the funeral law of Iulis (?), *ib.*
Sonnenschein (E. A.), notice of Horton-Smith's
Conditional Sentences, 220 ff.
 on the pres. and aor. in Greek jussives, 145*b*,
 344*b*
 and perf., 342*b*
 Sonnenschein's *A Greek Grammar for Schools based*
on the Principles and Requirements of the Gram-
matical Society, noticed, 60 ff.
 Sophocles *Antig.* (117-120), note on, 15
 parallelism between and the *Alcestis*, 440*b*
Philocletes, Graves' ed. of the, noticed, 53
Trach. (26-48), study in the interpretation of,
 200 ff.
 (56), note on, 395
 Sorrento, milestone at, 139*a*
 Spadarolo, discoveries at, 139*b*
 Stadtmüller's *Anthologia Graeca Epigrammatum*
Palatina cum Planudea (vol. i.), noticed, 261 f.
Starkie (W. J. M.), notice of Merry's ed. of the
Wasps, 117 ff.
 Statius *Silv.* (i. 6, 44), note on, 81
 statuary, canons of measurement in, 270*b*
 length of female hair in (5th cent.), 271*a*
 Stephenson's *Tacitus, Agricola and Germania*,
 noticed, 329*b*, 330
Sterrett (J. R. S.), notice of Tozer's *Selections*
from Strabo, 268 f.
Stewart (J. A.), notice of Susemihl and Hicks' ed.
 of the *Politics*, 454 ff.
Stone (E. D.), notice of Baker's *Latin and Greek*
Verse Translations, 369 f.
Storia della Sicilia e della Magna Graecia, Pais',
 noticed, 217 ff.
 Strabo, date and locality of his *magnum opus*, 269*a*
 of his birth and death, 268*b*
 estimates of his work, *ib.*
 only recognized in the Middle Ages, *ib.*
 Selections from, Tozer's, noticed, 268 f.
 Strachan-Davidson's *Cicero and the Fall of the Roman*
Republic, noticed, 123 ff.
 Streitberg's *Die Entstehung der Dehnstufe*, noticed,
 115 ff.
Stromateis, Clement of Alexandria's, critical notes on,
 97 ff., 202 ff., 207 ff., 337 ff., 385 ff., 433 ff.
 subjunctive, functions of the, 321*b*
 Sudhaus' *Philodemii Volumina Rhetorica*, noticed,
 358 f.
 Suetonius *Nero* (45), note on, 109 f.
 suicides, English law on, 249*b*, 250*a*
 'Sulpicia Cyclus,' the (Tibull. iv. 2-6), 77*a*, *b*
 Summaries of Periodicals:—
 American Journal of Philology, 140, 189*a*,
 381*a*, 477*b*
 Annuaire de la Société Française de Numis-
 matique, 238 f.
 Archäologisches Jahrbuch, 93 f.
 Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und
 Grammatik, 430
 Athenische Mittheilungen, 95, 286
 'Εφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική, 94 f.
 Hermathena, 381 f.
 Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins zu
 Berlin, 96, 140 f.
 Journal of Hellenic Studies, 233, 380
 Journal of Philology, 140*a*, 188, 477*a*
 Mnemosyne, 142, 189, 239 f., 429 f.
 Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik,
 141 f., 239, 284 f., 429, 478
 Numismatic Chronicle, 95*b*, 238*a*, 380*b*
 Numismatische Zeitschrift [Vienna], 380*b*
 Revue Archéologique, 95*b*, 286*b*
 Revue belge de Numismatique, 95*b*
 Revue de Philologie, 382, 476 f.
 Revue Numismatique, 95 f., 238*a*, 380*b*
 Rheinisches Museum, 141*b*, 189*b*, 285, 430*b*
 477 f.
 Rivista Italiana di Numismatica, 238*b*
 Transactions of the American Philological As-
 sociation, 285 f.
 Zeitschrift für Numismatik [Berlin], 381*a*
Summers (W. C.), notice of Damsté's *Lectiones*
Curtianae, 230 f.
 Summers' *A Study of the Argonautica of Valerius*
Flaccus, noticed, 111 ff.
 Susemihl and Hicks' ed. of Aristotle's *Politics* (books
 i.-v.), noticed, 454 ff.
 'syllabic writing,' 404*b*, 405*a*
 Syracuse, discovery of wall-paintings at, 237*b*
 importance of in the fifth and fourth centuries,
 218*a*
 'system' in Greek music, C. F. Abdy Williams on
 the, 421 ff.
- T.
- Tacitus *Agricola* (24), note on, 310 f.
 and *Germania*, Stephenson's ed. of, noticed,
 329*b*, 330
Dialogus, authorship and date of, 45*a*
 Bennett's ed. of, noticed, 48 f.
 chronological difficulties in, 47*a*
 dramatic structure of, 45*b*
 Gudeman's ed. of, noticed, 44 ff.
 lacunae in, 45*b*
 literary sources of, *ib.*
 MSS. of, 46*a*
Germania, Davis' ed. of, noticed, 329*b*
 Furneaux' ed. of, noticed, 326 ff.
 MSS. of, 329*a*
 political purpose of, 327*a*
 sources of information, 326*b*, 327*a*
 Tainto, bronze tablets at, 237*a*
 mosaic pavements at, 139*a*, *b*
 Tarraco, Roman bronze bell at, 93*a*
 Tarsis (the Hebrew)—Tarsus or Tartessus (?), 265*a*,
 378*b*, 379*a*, 476*b*
Tempuslehre, axioms of, 289 f.
 'tendency,' the loan-word, 406*b*
 Tenedos, coin-types of, 334*a*, *b*
 Tennyson's *Ode to Virgil*, 54*a*
tesera hospitalis, 428*b*
 testimonia for the text of Aristotle's *Nicomachean*
Ethics, etc., 1 ff.
 Teutonic laws on *wer-geld* for manslaughter by an
 animal, 250*b*
thalamitai, 266*a*, 378*b*
 Theodosius' *καὶ νόμοι δημοτικοί*, 318*a*, *b*
 the text-book of Choroeboscus, 318*b*
Theory of Conditional Sentences, Horton-Smith's,
 noticed, 220 ff.
θεπλιον, note on, 110
Thompson (E. S.), notes on the *Wasps* of Aristo-
 phanes, 306 f.
 notice of Graves' ed. of the *Wasps*, 121 ff.
 Thompson (W. H.), on Proclus, 316*b*
θώραξ (θωρήσσειν) of armour generally, 56*b*
θρανίται (thranni), 266*a*, 378*b*, 379*a*
 Thucydides i., Forbes' ed. of, noticed, 360 ff.
 vi. (11, 2 sq.), note on, 309 f.
 vii., Marchant's ed. of, noticed, 262 f.
 thymele in Greek theatres, Cook on the, 370 ff.
 Jebb (Smith's *Dict. of Ant.*) on the, 370*a*
 Tibullus i. (1 sq.), notes on, 108 f.
 iv. (2-6, 7, 14), genuineness of (?), 77*a*, *b*
 Belling's pamphlets on, noticed, 74 ff.

- til-ti*, 216a
 time indicated by participles, 445a, b
 of the grammatical tense (α) absolute (β) relative, 289b
 Tingad (N. Africa), inscription at, 477a
Torr (Cecil), notice of Crusius' *Die Delphischen Hymnen*, 177 f.
 Torr's *Ancient Ships*, noticed, 265 f.
 author's reply and reviewer's rejoinder, 378 f.
 author's supplementary reply, 476
Towle (J. A.), notice of Sihler's ed. of the *Protagoras*, 174 f.
 Tozer's *Selections from Strabo*, noticed, 268 f.
 Tralles hymn, the, 421a
 transpositions, how far consistent with textual criticism, 324b, 325b, 326a, b, 354a
 in Propertius, 324 f., 354 f.
 of Perikamp (Hor. *Ep. ad Pisones*), 325a
 Trapani and the *Odyssey*, Butler's theory on, 56 f.
 Trasacco (Latium), inscribed ram's head at, 428b
 Trèves, mosaic pavement and Roman inscription at, 428a
tribunitia potestas, the, 224a
 Troad, coinage of the, 333a, b
 and legends of Troy, 333b
tropaea, 302 ff.
 Augusti, 303 f.
 Marii, 303b
 tunny-fish as coin-type, the, 334a
 Turbia (La Turbie), 304a
Tyrrell (R. Y.), on parallels between Milton and Pindar, 11 f.
 Tyrrell and Purser's *Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero* (vol. iv.), noticed, 42 ff.
- U, V.
- Vacuna, the Sabine goddess, 187a
 Valcik (S. Russia), discovery of Greek statues at, 237b
 Valerius Asiaticus, influence of with his *gentiles*, 442b
 Valerius Flaccus *Argonautica*, causes of its unfinished state, 111a, b
 its divergences from Apollonius Rhodius, 111b
 predecessors, 111b, 112
 treatment of love, 112a, b
 Summer's *Study of*, noticed, 111 ff.
 vampires, 249 f.
 Varro *Sat. Menipp. (Eumen. 16 sq.)*, note on, 156b
uchat, the Egyptian, 334b
 Veneti of Armorica, ships of the, 266b
 verb, Streitberg's theory of the, 117a, b
 Verona, excavations of amphitheatre at, 139b
Verrall (A. W.), notice of Pater's *Greek Studies*, 225 ff.
 Verrall's *Euripides the Rationalist: a Study in the History of Art and Religion*, noticed, 407 ff.
 Verucchio, cemetery at, 139b
 Vetulonia, excavations at, 428b
vindex (vindicta, vindicare), 308a, b
 in Festus and the Laws of the XII. Tables, 308b
 Vindex, support of by his clan against Nero, 442b
 Virgil *Aeneid* (i.-vi.), Page's ed. of, noticed, 53 f.
 and Apollonius Rhodius, *De Mirmont* on, noticed, 175 ff.
 Culex, Corsini MS. of, 366a
 his aim in writing the *Aeneid*, 176a
 idiom of illustrated, 477a
 Papillon and Haigh's text of, noticed, 366 f.
 Vitellia, Vitoria, Vica Pota, the primitive deities, 187a
- Vitruvius on the Greek stage, 134a, 471a, b
 'vulgar' style of, 462b
uknā, 216b
Un nouvel hymne à Apollon, Weil and Reinach's, noticed, 467 ff.
unvollendete Handlung of the imperf. (or present), 343b
 **uogōs* (cp. *Fōra, Fēros*), orig. form of *vāx*, 115b
vollendete Handlung (radical idea of perfect stem), 290b
 Upton's codex of Epictetus, 35 f., 232a, 235b
 Usener's theory of the transmission of the Platonic text, 313a
 Uspensky Psalter, date of the, 466b
- W.
- Wachsmuth's *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, noticed, 466 f.
 Waddell's *The Parmenides of Plato*, noticed, 312 ff.
Walters (H. B.), *Monthly Record*, 335, 379 f., 428 f.
 Walton's *Cult of Asklepios* ['Cornell Studies in Classical Philology'], noticed, 138
Warr (George C. W.), In Memoriam: Charles Thomas Newton, K.C.B., 85
 on the Hesiodic Hecate, 390 ff.
 Wattenbach's *Anleitung zur griechischen Palaeographie*, noticed, 465 f.
Wayte (W.), notice of Freese's transl. of Isocrates, 125 f.
 Weil and Reinach's *Un nouvel hymne à Apollon*, noticed, 467 ff.
 'white horse' in Berkshire, the, 137b
 Whitney (William Dwight), the late, 140a
 Wilkins' *The Orations of Cicero against Catiline*, noticed, 263 ff.
Williams (C. F. Abdy), on the 'System' in Greek music, 421 ff.
Wilson (J. Cook), on testimonia for the text of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, for the *Metaphysics* and for the *Posterior Analytics*, 1 ff.
 Winchester and Claudius' army of occupation, 236a
 Wissowa's ed. of Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie*, noticed, 113 f.
Word-Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius, Cooper's, noticed, 462 f.
 Word-Forms, Streitberg's theory of, noticed, 115 ff.
 Wordsworth compared with Pindar, 11
 Wroth's *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Troas, Aeolis, and Lesbos*, noticed, 333 ff.
- X.
- Xenophon's *Hellenica* i. and ii., etc., Blake's, noticed, 231
- Z.
- Zeitsstufe* (*Actionsart* or *Zeitart* of the grammatical tense, 128a, 289b
 restricted to tenses of the *indicative*, 289b
 Zeus Apomyios) (Baal Zebub, 69a
Ζάβρος, 95a
Ἐπιδήμιος, *ib.*
 Laphystius, 69a
 Lycaeus, 69 f.
 derivation of, 69a
 Semitic origin of, 69 f.
 Zoeller's *Römische Staats- und Rechtsaltertümer, ein Kompendium für das Studium und die Praxis*, noticed, 223 f.
zugilai, 266a, 378b
 Zugmental and Saalburg, Roman camps at, 237b

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

Note.—References to the Orators are given by number of speech and section, to Aristotle by the paging of the Berlin edition, to Cicero by section, to Plato by Stephanus' paging, to Plautus and Terence by the continuous numeration where such exists. It will materially assist subsequent readers of the 'Review' if contributors will in future conform as far as possible to this system.

A.

- Achaëus (9: *fr.* 19, 20), 105*b*
 Aelian:—
H.N. xvi. (23 Jacobs on), 206*b*
 Aeschines (3, 209), 73*a*
In Ctes. (244), 249*b*
 Aeschylus:—
Ag. (50), 363*a*; (364), 65*b*; (413), 363*b*; (469), 363*a*; (539), 459*a*; (556), 362*a*; (562), 363*b*; (604=587 Paley), 147*b*; (620), 119*a*; (758=728 Herm.), 312*b*; (777), 363*a*; (879=851 Paley), 148*a*; (906=875 Paley), 146*a*; (922, 948), 275*b*; 975 *sqq.*, 1006, 1322, 363*b*; (1391 *sq.*), 362*b*; (1589), 363*b*
Cho. (199, 239), 363*b*; (267), 65*b*; (323 *sqq.*), 280*b*
Eum. (69), 363*a*; (440), 279*b*; (483), 362*b*; (528), 149*a*; (576), 363*a*; (690 *sqq.*), 430*b*; (710, 718), 279*b*
Pers. (838), 52*a*; (975), 363*a*
Prom. (354), 363*a*; (613), 15*b*
Suppl. (244), 221*a*; (629), 362*b*; (676), 393*a*; (826 *sqq.*), 363*a*
Theb. (576), 363*b*
fr. (41 D.), 50*a*; (98 D., 238 D., 372 D.), 49*b*
fr. Ixion (*ap.* Eustath.), 280*b*
 Alcaeus:—
fr. (44), 149*b*
 Alcidas:—
περί Σοφιστῶν (§§ 3, 6, 8, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 24, 26, 34), 72*b*
 Alexander:—
Anal. pr. (58), 203*a*
 Andocides:—
De Myst. (38), 134*b*; (43), 63*a*, 65*b*
Anth. Pal. iii., 280*a*; v. (38, 168), 262*a*; (197, 236), 262*b*; vi. (147), *ib.*
On Anacreon (1-2), 262*a*
Proem of Meleager (31), *ib.*
 Antiochus (*ap.* Strabo 262 C), 219*a*
 Antoninus ii. (17), 439*a*; v. (13), 386*b*; xii. (6), *ib.*
 Apollodorus:—
Bibl. epit. (3, 21), 473*a*
 Apollonius Dyscolus:—
De Pronom. (144*b*), 234*b*
 Apollonius Rhodius:—
Argonautica i. (1125), 306*a*; ii. (852), 113*b*; iii. (62 schol. on), 278*b*; (200 schol. on), 391*b*; (1150 schol. on), 477*a*
 Apuleius:—
Met. i. (12), 367*b*
 Archilochus:—
fr. (41, 44), 40*a*
 Aristides Quintilianus (p. 13 Meibom), 422*a* (n.); (pp. 15-17), 421 *ff.*; (p. 26), 178*a*
 Aristophanes:—
Ach. (239 *sqq.*), 136*a*; (301), 118*b*; (347), 120*b*; (732), 134*b*
Av. (20 *sqq.*, 49 *sqq.*, 175), 134*b*; (511), 119*a*; (574 schol. on), 282*b*
Ecc. (195, 315), 119*b*; (479), 134*b*; (827), 119*b*; (1152), 134*b*
Eq. (81), 66*a*; (106), 147*b*; (149 and schol. on), 134*b*, 375*a*; (152, 202), 148*a*; (221), 147*b*; (244, 246), 148*a*; (909 *sq.*), 146*b*; (989 *sqq.*), 470*a*; (1024, 1036), 147*b*; (1378 *sqq.*), 121*a*, 122*a*
Lysistr. (288), 134*b*
Nub. (47), 173*a*; (62), 173*b*; (144, 148, 218 *sq.*), 172*b*; (230, 264, 266, 281, 284), 173*a*; (332), 173*b*; (334), 173*a*; (337, 376), 173*b*; (439, 453, 489), 173*a*; (505), 61*b*; (508, 523), 173*b*; (530), 173*a*; (541), 173*b*; (582, 627, 814), 173*a*; (824), 174*b*; (870), 173*b*; (880), 174*a*; (882), 61*b*; (985), 173*b*; (1005 schol. on), 89*b*; (1010, 1022), 173*a*; (1036, 1089 *sqq.*), 174*a*; (1130), 173*b*; (1149), 174*b*; (1194, 1236), 174*a*; (1271, 1277), 174*b*; (1304), 174*a*; (1309), 173*b*; (1315), 174*a*; (1342), 174*b*; (1355), 173*b*; (1384), 174*b*; (1418), 173*b*; (1431), 174*b*
Pax (83, 154), 148*b*; (195), 147*a*; (259), 61*b*; (301), 148*b*; (348), 427*b*; (425), 298*a*; (451), 430*a*; (516), 148*b*; (551), 147*b*; (555), 148*b*; (602), 148*a*; (650), 146*b*; (664, 670, 679), 147*b*; (725), 134*b*, 136*b*; (785, 888), 147*b*; (1201), 120*b*
Plut. (216), 221*b*; (405), 221*a*; (663), 427*b*; (1019), 120*b*
Ran. (73 schol. on), 441*b*; (322), 314*a*; (1297 schol. on), 477*a*

Aristophanes, continued—

Thesm. (981), 174a

Vesp. (3, 10, 12, **21**), 120a; (25, **27**), 119a; (**36**), 121b; (40), 120a; (61), 120a, 122a; (92, 110), 120a; (121), 119b; (125, 128), 120a; (135), 122a; (**151**), 120a, 122b; (155), 119a, 122a; (201), 120a; (**221**, 242, 243, 250), 120b; (296), 117b; (304), 120b; (308), 118a; (319), 120a; (325 sq.), 122b; (334), 120b; (335, 339), 118b; (**341** sq.), 306a; (343), 118b; (353), 120a; (357), 120b; (370), 118b; (373), 306b; (385), 119b; (407 sq., 409, 410), 118a; (**411**), 118b; (**412**), 118a; (417, **418**), 118b; (422), 120a; (448, 451), 119b; (452), 120a; (459), 122b, 123a; (460), 120b; (465, 468), 118a; (**471**), 119a; (474, 526), 118b; (529 sq.), 306b; (532), 118b; (538, **539**), 306b; (544), 120a; (**602**), 119a; (606), 119b; (632, 638), 118b; (**651**), 119b; (661), 120b; (671), 61b; (676), 120a; (691), 120b; (694), 119b; (**709**), 119a; (**713**), 122a; (718), 307a; (736, 749), 118b; (771), 120b; (773), 119b; (790), 120a; (795), 119b; (866, 886, 912), 119a; (917), 120b; (934), 119a; (937), 119b; (955), 120b; (957), 119b; (978), 120a; (**1025** sq.), 121b, 122a; (1032), 120a; (**1037**), 307a, b; (**1050**), 307b; (1091), 119a, 307a; (1107, 1116), 120a; (**1119**), 307b; (1157, 1159, 1168, 1184), 119b; (1208 sq.), 120b, 121a; (1220, 1246), 122b; (1267), 123a; (1284 sq., **1291**), 307a; (1309, 1340), 119b; (1342), 134b; (1397), 121a; (1418), 120a; (1434), 120a, 121b; (1454), 1455, 1483, 121b; (1490), 119b; (1514), 134b

fr. (48), 120b

Aristotle:—

Æt. pol. (14, 4), 106b; (**15**, **1**), 166 f.; (**15**, **4**), 114b; (17, 1), 107a; (17, 8), 104b; (18, 1), 114b; (**22**, **2**), 107a; (**26**, **1**), 107a, b; (27, 1); 108a; (29), 360b; (**30**, **3**, **4**), 107b; (**33** ad fin.), 108a; (**35**, **2**), 73b, 108a; (**47**, **5**), 108b; (54, 2), 73b; (56), 136a; (57), 250b; (58), 307a; (59, 6), 72b

Eth. Eudem. (1220a 39), 2a

Eth. Nic. iii. (1), 251a; (1094b 26, 1095a 1), 3b (n.); (1103a 14), 1a, 2a, b; (1142a 11–16, 16–20), 2b (and n.); (1144b 4), 1b, 2a; (1147a 18–22), 2b (n.); (1179b 10), 4b; x. (7, 6), 457a

Met. a. (6), 315a; (9), 315b; (ε 1, cf. 1026a 19: κ 7, cf. 1064b 2: λ, 1072a 26), 2a

Poet. (6), 301a; (18), 135a; (**1448a** **33**), 214b; (1448b 10, **1451b** **13**), 215a; (1452a 16–1452b 14), 251b; (1452a 32), 252b; (1454b 29), 253a; (**1459a** **17**), 214b; (**1459b** **21**, 1462a 19), 215b

Pol. (**1253a** **33**, **1256a** **11**), 455a; (1259b 34), 4b; (1261a 22 sq.), 455a; (**1264a** **18**, b 10), 455b; (1274a), 108a; (1274b 39 sq., **1275a** **35**, **1277a** **5**), 456a; (**1277a** **26**, b 28 sq., **1279b** **38**), 456b; (1324a 13–1325b 34), 457a, b, (**1330a** **36**), 457b; (1350b), 107a

Post. An. (78b 32, 87a 30), 3b*Probl.* xix., 425b*Rhet.* i. ii. 252b; ii. (24, 5), 430b; (1390b), 107b

Aristoxenus (p. 6), 424a; (p. 15), 421b (n.); (p. 45 sq.), 178b; (p. 74), 422a (n.)

Athenaeus:—

De Machinis (p. 29), 135b

Athenaeus:—

Deipnosophistae ii. (48 D, F), 275a; iii. (98), 319b; iv. (138 F, 140 F), 427b; v. (197 A), 275a; xi. (474 D), ib.

Augustine:—

Civ. Dei v. (26), 165a

Ausonius:—

Mos. (110 sq.), 199a

B.

Bacchius Senior (p. 2), 421b (n.)

Bacchylides (*ap. Anth. Pal.* vi. 313), 281a

fr. (9), 282a

C.

Caesar:—

Bell. Civ. ii. (14: 25), 259b*Bell. Gall.* i. (**52**, **4**), 142a

Callimachus:—

In Del. (312 sq.), 376a*In Dian.* (266 sq.), ib.

Carcinus:—

fr. (**8**), 106b

Catullus iv. (9, 18), 305b; ix., 41a; xii. (**6**), 304a, b; xvi. (3, 13), 40b; xxix. (4), 305b; xxx. (**3**), 304b, 305a; xxxiv. (12), 304b; xxxvi. (9, 16), 305a; li. 41b; lv., 305a; lxi. (**21**, **71** sq.), 305a; (**76** sq., 231), 305b; lxii. (6 sq.), ib.; lxiii. (13), 306a; (**50**, 51, **53** sq., 68), 305b; (**75**, 91), 306a; lxiv., 41b; (**16**), 306a; (20, 25), 306b; (31), 305a; (141), 306b; (180, 183), 17a; lxvi. (**11**), 306a, b; lxviii., 42a, b; (74), 352a; lxxvi. (25), 30b; xc. (**1** sq.), 306b

Chaeremon:—

fr. (**10**), 105b; (**12**), 105b, 106a; (**13**), 106a

Cicero:—

Acad. ii. (4, 11), 366b; (106), 359a*De Fin.* i. (20), 359a; ii. (83), 29b; (119), 358a*De Legg.* iii. (6), 6b; (12, 27), 7a; (17, 393), 309a*De Nat. Deor.* i. (20, 52: 24, 67), 259b; (116), 340a; ii. (73, 83 sq., 115), 389a; iii. (79, 80), 150a*De Off.* iii. (**6**, **29**), 64b, 222a (n.); (24, 92), 65a*De Orat.* i. (62), 359b; ii. (23), 149a; (364), 43a; iii. (214), 17a*Div.* ii. (41, 85), 156b*Epp. ad Att.* i. (1, 1), 264a; (**1**, **2** Lambinus and Bosius on), 246a; (2, 1), 264a; (18, 3), 131b; iv. (16, 12 Bosius on), 245b; v. (**4**, **4**), 429b; vii. (**2**, **3** Lambinus on), 243a; (**11**), 42b; (**18**, **1** Lambinus on), 245b; viii. (**3**, **4**), 43a; (4: 5), 44b; (9, 1 sq.), 43a; ix.(7 A), 43b; (**9**: **10**: 11 A), 43a; x. (**8**, **4**), 243a; (**10**, **5**), 244a; (11: 12), 43a; (12, 2), 242b (n.); (**12**, **7** Lambinus and Bosius on), 246a; (13, 7 Bosius on), 245b; (**16**), 43b; (18), 44b; xi. (7, 1), 241b (n.); (**9**, **1**), 245a; (**12**, **1**), 242b; (**23**, **2**), 243b; (**23**, **3**), 244b; xii. (**1**, **2**), 245a; (**4**, **2**), 246b; (**18**, **1**), 243b; (**21**, **2**), 244b; (**35**, **1**), 242b; (**38**, **4**), 244b; xiii. (11, 1), 242b; (33, 4), 241b (n.); (**40**, **1**), 244b; (51, 2), 542b; (**52**, **1**), 245a; xiv. (**14**, **1**), 244b; (18), 210a; (**20**, **5**), 244b; xv. (**1**, **4**: **2**, **2**), 243b; (**2**, **4**: **3**, **1**), 244b; (**4**, **1**), 246b; (17, 1), 43a; (**18**, **1**), 243b; (**19**, **1**), 245a; (**20**, **1**), 243b; (**20**, **2**; **24**), 244b; (**26**, **1**), 243b, 245a, 246b; (**26**, **4**), 244a, 245a; (29, 2), 241b (n.); xvi. (1, 1), ib.; (**4**, **4**), 245a; (**11**, **8**: **12**: **14**, **3**), 244a; (**13a**, **2**), 245a*Epp. ad Fam.* vii. (28), 43b; viii. (**16**), ib.*Epp. ad Q. F.* ii. (**9**, **3**), 429b

Cicero, continued—

- In Cat.* i. (3), 264b; ii. (5), 265a: (19: 20), 264b: (25), 265a; iv. (10: 11), 264b
In Pis. (68, 70), 358a
In Rull. ii. (62), 124b
In Verr. ii. (1, 108), 259b
Phil. viii. (7, 20), *ib.*; xiii. (28), 264b
Pro Arch. (9), 430a
Pro Cael. (13), 264a
Pro Cluent. (141), 328a
Pro Domo (17, 43), 6b; (17, 45), 6a, b, 8a
Pro Flacc. (60), 259b
Pro Mil. (3), 331a, 332a; (6), 331a; (8), 331b; (11), 331a; (15, 21), 331b; (23), 331a; (28, 34, 35, 39, 42, 56, 58), 331b; (70), 331a; (81), 331b; (82, 84), 332a
Pro Mur. (60), 239b
Pro Sest. (24, 53), 259b
Tusc. i. (34, 82), *ib.*; ii. (4), 64b; iv. (35), *ib.*, 222a (n.)

Claudian:—

- Bell. Gild.* (54, 69, 130, 247), 169a; (299), 169b; ([347], 395, 402, 414, 441), 169a
Carm. Min. (21, 1 sq.: 22), 163b; (27, 91), 166a; (32, 5), 166b; (32, 7), 164b; (41, 13 sq.), 163b; (50), 164b
De Kapitu i. (6, 8, 16, 21), 168a: (30), 164a: (35, 59 sq., 61, 67, 71, 98, 99, 103, 113), 168a: (122), 168b: (140 sq., 143, 159), 168a: (164, 165, 171-8, 172, 174, 195, 213, 244, 288), 168b; ii. (*praef.* 50), 164a: (23 sq.), 169b: (143), 168a
Eutrop. ii. (*praef.* 9), 167b
Gigant. (7, 16, 17, 22, 60, 64, 68), 169b
Laus Ser. (86 sq.), 167b
Pan. Manl. Theod. (270), 168a; (300), 167b; (332), 168a
Pan. Prob. et Ol. (32), 169b; (167 sq.), 163b; (201 sq.), 166a
IV. Cons. Hon. (315, 432), 166a; (509 sq., 636 sq.), 166a, b
Ruf. i. (230), 169a: (307), 163b; ii. (121), *ib.*: (279), 169a
Stil. ii. (345), 167b

Clement of Alexandria:—

- De Div. Serv.* (3), 434a; (17), 435b
Paed. i. (p. 99 Potter on), 103b; ii. (81 p. 219), 100a; iii. (p. 290), 203b
Protrep. (p. 13), 340a
Strom. i. (§ 7 p. 319), 103b; (p. 342), 98a; (p. 370), 102b; (p. 377), 299a; (§ 182 p. 427), 97a
 ii. (1), 97a; (p. 448), 101b; (p. 474), 387b
 iii. (13), 102b; (p. 514), 103a; (p. 545), 203b
 iv. (§ 1 p. 563, §§ 2, 3 p. 564), 97a; (§§ 4, 5 p. 565), 97a, b; (§ 6 p. 565, § 8 p. 566), 97b; (§ 9 p. 567), 97b, 98a; (§ 11 p. 568, § 14 p. 569, § 15 p. 570), 98a; (§ 16), 97a; (§ 18 p. 572, §§ 23, 24 p. 574, §§ 25-26, 27 p. 575), 98b; (§ 28 p. 576), 99a; (§ 29 p. 576), 98a; (§§ 34, 36-7 p. 579, § 38 p. 580, §§ 38, 39 p. 581), 99a; (§ 40 p. 581, § 43 p. 582, §§ 44, 45 p. 583, § 56 p. 590, § 61 p. 591, § 62 p. 592), 99b; (§ 63 p. 592, § 67 pp. 593, 594, § 68 p. 594, § 72 p. 596), 100a; (§ 73 p. 596, §§ 75, 76, 77 p. 597, §§ 78, 79 p. 598, § 80 p. 599), 100b; (§ 81 pp. 599, 600, § 82 p. 600, § 84 p. 601, 101a; (§§ 85, 86 p. 601, §§ 87, 88 p. 602, §§ 89, 90 p. 603), 101b; (§ 91 p. 604, §§ 93, 94 p. 605, §§ 95, 96 p. 606), 102a; (§ 97 p. 606), 102a, b; (§§ 97, 98 p. 607), 102b; (§ 103 p. 609, § 110 p. 613, § 112 p. 614, §§ 114, 115 p. 615, § 120 p.

Clement of Alexandria, continued—

- 618, § 124 p. 620, § 137 p. 626), 103a; (§ 138 p. 627, § 142 p. 628, § 145 pp. 629, 630, § 147 p. 631), 103b; (§§ 150, 151 p. 632, § 153 p. 633, §§ 154, 155 p. 634, §§ 157, 158 p. 635), 104a; (§§ 159, 160 p. 636, § 161 p. 637, § 162 p. 638, § 165 p. 639), 104b; (§ 166 p. 639, § 169 p. 641), 105a; (§ 171 p. 641, § 172 p. 642), 105b
 v. (§ 1 p. 643), 202a, 299b; (§§ 1, 2 p. 644), 202b; (§ 4 p. 645, § 6 p. 646, § 7 p. 647, § 9 p. 649), 203a; (§ 9 p. 650), 203b, 299b; (§ 10 p. 650), 203b, 297a; (§ 19 p. 656, § 20 p. 657, §§ 23, 24 p. 658, §§ 26, 27 p. 660), 203b; (p. 661), 205b; (§ 30 p. 663, §§ 31, 32 p. 664, § 33 p. 665, § 34 p. 666, § 35 p. 667, § 38 p. 668, § 39 p. 669), 204a; (§ 41 p. 670), 104b; (§ 45 p. 673, § 48 p. 674, § 51 p. 676, § 53 p. 678), 204b; (p. 679), 98b; (§ 57 p. 680, § 59 p. 681), 204b; (p. 681), 205b; (§ 64 pp. 684, 685, § 68 p. 687, § 69 p. 688, § 71 p. 689, §§ 76, 77 p. 692, § 79 p. 693), 205a; (§ 81 p. 695), 205a, b; (§ 87 p. 698, § 89 p. 699, §§ 91, 92 p. 701, § 95 p. 703, § 98 p. 706), 205b; (§ 102 pp. 709, 710), 205b, 206a; (§ 104 p. 711, § 109 pp. 714, 715, § 116 p. 718, § 118 p. 719, § 131 p. 728, § 133 p. 729), 206a; (§ 138 p. 732, § 139 p. 735), 206b
 vi. (§§ 1, 2 p. 736), 297a, b; (§§ 3, 4 p. 737, § 6 p. 738, § 18 p. 747, §§ 20, 22 p. 748), 298a; (§ 23 p. 750), 298b; (§ 28 p. 752), 204b; (§ 29 p. 753, §§ 30, 31 p. 754), 298b; (§ 32 p. 755), 298b, 299a; (§§ 34, 35 p. 756, § 36 p. 757, § 37 p. 758, § 38 pp. 758, 759), 299a; (§ 39 pp. 759, 760, § 40 p. 760), 299b; (§ 41 p. 760), 203b, 299b; (§ 42 p. 761), 202a, 299b; (§§ 43, 44 p. 762, §§ 45, 46 p. 763), 300a; (§ 47 p. 764), 300a, b; (p. 765), 203a (n.); (§§ 48, 49 p. 765, §§ 50, 51, 52 p. 766, § 53 p. 767), 300b; (§ 54 p. 767), 300b, 301a; (§§ 55, 56 p. 768), 301a; (§ 57 p. 769), 205b, 301b; (§ 58 p. 769, § 59 p. 770), 301b; (§ 60 p. 770), 302a, b; (§ 61 p. 771, § 63 p. 772), 302b; (§ 65 pp. 772, 773, § 66 p. 773, § 68 p. 774), 337a; (§ 69 p. 775, § 71 pp. 775, 776, § 73 p. 776), 337b; (§§ 73, 74, 75 p. 777, §§ 76, 77 p. 778, § 78 p. 779), 338a; (§ 80 p. 779), 338a, b; (§ 81 p. 780, § 84), 338b; (§ 86 p. 783, § 90 p. 785, § 93 p. 786, § 94 p. 787, §§ 95, 96 p. 788, § 100 p. 790), 339a; (§§ 101, 102 p. 791, §§ 106, 107 p. 793, § 110 p. 795, § 112 p. 796), 339b; (§§ 114, 115 p. 798, §§ 117, 118 p. 799), 340a; (§ 120 p. 800), 340a, 337a; (§ 121 p. 800, § 122 p. 801, §§ 125, 126 p. 803, § 127 p. 804), 340a; (§ 128 p. 804, § 129 p. 805, § 132 p. 806, §§ 137, 138 p. 810, § 140 p. 811), 340b; (§ 142 p. 813, § 147 p. 816, § 150 p. 818, § 152 p. 819, § 153 pp. 819, 820), 341a; (§ 154 p. 820, § 157 p. 822, § 159 p. 823, § 160 p. 824, § 162 p. 825, §§ 165, 166 p. 826), 341b; (§§ 167, 168 p. 827), 342a, b
 vii. (§ 1 p. 828, §§ 2, 3 p. 829), 385a; (§ 3 pp. 830, 831), 385b; (§ 5 p. 831), 385b, 386a; (§§ 6, 7, 8 p. 832, § 9 p. 833, § 10 p. 834), 386a; (§ 11 p. 834), 386a, b; (§ 13 pp. 835, 836, § 14 p. 836, § 15 pp. 836, 837, § 16 p. 837), 386b; (§ 17 p. 838, § 18 pp. 838, 839, § 19 p. 839, § 20 pp. 839, 840), 387a; (§ 21 p. 840, §§ 22, 23 p. 841, § 25 p. 843, § 27 p. 844), 387b; (§ 28 p. 845), 387b, 388a; (§ 29 p. 845), 388a; (§ 29 p. 846), 388a, b; (§ 30 p. 846, § 31 pp. 847, 848, § 32 p. 848, § 33

Clement of Alexandria, *continued*—

pp. 849, 850, § 34 p. 850, 388b; (§ 35 pp. 851, 852, §§ 36, 37 p. 852), 389a; (§ 38 pp. 853, 854, § 40 p. 854), 389b; (p. 854), 339b; (§§ 41, 42 p. 855, § 43 pp. 856, 857, § 44 p. 857), 389b; (§ 44 pp. 857, 858), 390a; (§ 45 p. 858), 390a, b; (§ 46 p. 858, §§ 46, 47 p. 859), 433a; (§ 48 p. 859), 433a, b; (§ 49 pp. 859, 861), 433b; (§ 50 p. 861, § 51 p. 862, § 53 pp. 863, 864, § 55 p. 864), 434a; (§ 56 p. 865), 434a, b; (§ 57 pp. 865, 866, § 58 p. 866, § 60 p. 867, §§ 61, 62 p. 868, § 63 p. 869), 434b; (§§ 65, 66 p. 870, § 66 p. 871), 435a; (p. 871), 100b; (§ 67 p. 872, § 69 p. 873, § 70 p. 874, § 72 p. 875, § 74 p. 876), 435a; (§ 76 p. 877, § 77 p. 878), 435b; (p. 878), 339b; (§ 78 p. 879), 435b, 436a; (§§ 79, 80 p. 880, § 80 p. 881), 436a; (§ 81 p. 881), 436a, b; (§§ 82, 83 p. 882, § 84 p. 883), 436b; (§§ 85, 86, p. 884, § 87 p. 885), 437a; (§ 88 p. 885), 437a, b; (§§ 88, 89 p. 886, §§ 89, 90 p. 887, §§ 91, 92 p. 888), 437b; (§ 93 p. 889), 437b, 438a; (§§ 94, 95 p. 890, § 96 p. 891), 438a; (§§ 97, 98 p. 892, § 101 p. 894, § 102 p. 895, §§ 103, 104 p. 896), 438b; (§ 107 pp. 898, 899), 439a; (§ 109 p. 900, § 110 p. 901), 439b; (p. 901), 298a

Cratinus (*ap.* Pollux viii. 31), 73a

Curtius iii. (2, 9: **11**, **8**), 231a: (11, 20), 153b: (12, 21), 231b: (12, 24), 231a; iv. (**1**, **3**), 96a: (1, 10), 153b: (**1**, **36**: **2**, **13**: 3, 12), 231a: (3, 13), 478a: (**3**, **22**), 230a: (5, 4: 5, 5: 9, 6), 231b: (**9**, **15**: 12, 9), 231a: (12, 23), 230b: (14, 1), 231b; v. (1, 11), *ib.*: (**12**, **8**), 231a: vi. (3, 3), 231b: (**5**, **11**), 231a: (7, 27: 9, 9), 260a: (9, 21), 231a; vii. (**2**, **23**), 230a: (8, 19), 231b: viii. (1, 1: 1, 38), *ib.*: (10, 20), 153b: (13, 24), 260a; ix. (1, 17), 231b: (**1**, **23**), 230b: (2, 9: **2**, **13**: **2**, **23**: 5, 1), 231b: (5, 2), 231a: (6, 21), 260a, b: (10, 24), 231b; x. (5, 25), 231a

D.

Demosthenes (4, 5), 73b; (18, 23), 72a; (19, 29), 72a (n.); (19, 158: 21, 124), 73b; (21, 204), 72a (n.); (23, 175), 72b; (23, 195), 72a (n.); (25, 56), 73b; (27, 26: 29, 5), 72a; (34, 35), 73b; (40 §§ 21, 53), 72a; (41, 16), 73a; (48, 51), 72a; (53 §§ 7, 8), 73b; (57, 53), 73a; (58 §§ 12, 36: 59, 125), 72a

Aristocr. (76), 250b

Fals. Leg. (318, 153), 294a

Lept. (492, 117), 221b

Macart. (62), 248b

Mid. (17), 134b

Neacr. (70), 72a

Timocr. (1201), 221a

Dio Cassius lxx. (**1**, **1**), 367b; liii. (26, 4 *sq.*), 303b; liv. (9), 303a

Dio Chrysostom (20, 9), 131b

Diodorus Siculus iv. (45), 391b

Diogenes Laertius i. (11, 5), 371a; vi. (16), 244b

Dionysius Halicarnassensis i. (**19**), 219b: (21), 475b: v. (37), 107a

De Comp. Verb. (p. **218** Reiske), 203b

De Isocr. (3), 126a

Rhet. (p. 151, 4: p. 1007), 359a

E.

Ennius (*ap.* Cic. *De Div.* i. 31, 66), 16a

Epictetus:—

Dissertationes (*Epist. Tit.* and § 1), 38

- i. (**1**, **3**), 33a, 38, 39, 232a, 233b; (1, 4), 37b; (**1**, **7**), 33b, 232a, 234b; (**1**, **13**), 33b; (**1**, **20**), 33b, 232a; (1, 30), 39; (1, 31), 38; (**1**, **32**), 33b, 232a; (2, 4), 38; (2, 6), 35b; (2, 17), 37b; (2, 36: 4, 1: 4, 3: 4, 9), 38; (4, 20), 37a; (4, 23), 35b; (**4**, **24**), 34a, 232a; (4, 30), 37b; (**4**, **31**), 32b; (5, 2: 5, 9), 38; (6, 3), 35b; (**6**, **9**), 34a, 35b; (**6**, **10**), 34a; (**6**, **14**), 34b; (**6**, **20**), 33a; (6, 24: 6, 41), 38; (6, 42), 35b; (**7**, **3**), 32b; (**7**, **6**), 34b; (7, 12), 37b; (**7**, **18**), 36b; (**7**, **25**), 39, 233b; (**7**, **32**), 34b; (**8**, **13**), 33a; (**8**, **16**: **9**, **11**), 35a; (**9**, **16**), 35b; (9, 30), 38, 233b; (10, 2), 38; (**10**, **7**), 34b; (**10**, **10**), 37a; (**11**, **2**), 35b; (11, 3), 38; (11, 18), 35b; (11, 27), 36a; (**11**, **28**), 32b; (11, 32), 36a, 37b; (11, 38), 33b; (12, 6), 38; (12, 26), 39; (**12**, **30**), 32b, 39; (14, 7), 38; (14, 10), 35b; (14, 13), 36a; (**14**, **16**), 38, 233b; (**15**, **2**), 33a; (**15**, **8**), 32b, 36a; (16, 12: **16**, **19**), 35b; (16, 20), 36a; (16, 24), 233b; (**17**, **11**), 39, 233b; (17, 16), 38; (**18**, **9**), 32b; (19 *Tit.*), 38; (**19**, **11**), 37a; (20, 11), 35b; (**20**, **15**), 35a; (22, 6), 35b, 38; (22, 10), 38; (**24**, **6**), 33a; (**25**, **4**), 37a, 38; (**25**, **14**), 39, 233b; (**25**, **24**), 37b, 232b, 234b; (26, 5), 35b; (**26**, **6**), 38, 233b; (26, 12), 33b; (**26**, **13**: 28, 9), 32b; (**28**, **18**), 35b, 36a, 39, 233b; (**28**, **19**: 28, 21), 37a; (29, 1), 35a; (29, 21), 39; (29, 28), 38; (29, 51), 36a; (30, 2), 33a; (30, 4), 35a
- ii. (1, 4), 35a; (2, 4: 9, 11), 37a; (18, 15: 20, 33: 21, 1: 22, 12), 37b; (22, 29), 35a
- iii. (1, 14: 5, 6), 37b; (17, 3), 37a; (18, 7: 22), 32b; (22, 33), 100b; (22, 103), 35a
- iv. (1, 151), 33b; (1, 161), 37a; (11, 35), 35b

Enchir. (24, 3, 4), 37a

Euanthius:—

De Trag. et Com. (Gronov. *Thesaur.* viii. 1681), 376a

Euripides:—

Alc. (24 *sqq.*), 411a, 440b; (**35**), 51b; (**44**), 51a; (47, **50**), 51b; (52), 119a; (**64**), 51a; (91 *sq.*, **134**), 52a; (146), 51b; (**159**, **164**, 179), 52a; (**185**), 51a; (205 *sqq.*), 440b; (**213**), 51b; (**235**, **237**, **245**, **254** *sq.*), 51a; (259 *sqq.*), 440b; (**287** *sq.*), 51a; (290 *sqq.*), 411a; (**304**), 51a, 52a; (**320**), 52a; (**321**), 51a; (**347**), 51b; (371, **437**), 52a; (**458**), 51b; (466 *sqq.*), 411a; (**487**), 52a; (**514**, **527**, **528**), 51b; (**548**), 52a; (**552**, **565** *sq.*, **594**), 51b; (**595**), 52a, b; (**599**), 51b; (630), 52b; (**631**, **632**), 51b; (640), 52b; (**649**), 51b; (679, 692 *sq.*, **764**, 777, 779, **795**, **798**), 52b; (**808**), 51b; (826, 834, **836**), 52b; (950 *sqq.*, 983), 410b; (**986**), 51b; (1032, 1037), 52b; (**1045**), 51b; (1049), 52b; (**1063**, **1071**, **1123**, **1124**, **1157**), 51b; (1158), 52b

Andr. (253), 61b; (923), 148b

Bacch. (201, 287 *sqq.*), 226a; (333 *sqq.*), 227b; (343, 367), 61b; (406), 14a; (1257), 212b

El. (489), 134b

Hec. (113), 63a; (**209** *sq.*), 171b; (212), 440b; (**221**, **234** *sqq.*, 261), 171b; (309, 353), 171a; (398), 171b; (423), 147b; (435 *sqq.*,

Euripides, continued—

441 sqq., **461**, 171b; (**481**), 171a; (**490**), 171b; (504), 171a; (522), 52a; (**588**), 171a; (**599**), 171b; (614), 171a; (**620**), 171b; (**624**), 171a; (774, 793 sqq.), 171a; (**828**), 171b; (**847**, 854), 171a; (**867**), 171b; (**888**), 172a; (901), 171a; (**1025** sqq., 1032), 172a; (**1042**), 171a; (1058), 171b; (**1074**, **1101**), 171a; (1155), 172b; (1174), 172a; (1177), 171b; (**1185** sq.), 171a; (1191), 172b; (1263), 171b; (**1270**), 172b

Hcl. (436), 61b; (676 sqq., 1411), 52a; (1459 sq.), 13b

Herc. Fur. (119), 134b; (605), 63a; (1081 sqq.), 136a; (1354), 52a

Hippol. (6), 14a; (110), 52a

Ion (727 sqq.), 134b; (1141, 1143), 275a; (1163), 272a (n.); (**1286**, **1291**), 346b (n.)

Iph. T. (481), 52b; (582, **588**), 14b; (**603**), 172a; (706), 149b

Med. (11), 396b; (12, **13**), 396a; (16), 396b; (91), 146a; (230), 62b; (352), 221a; (623), 148b; (678), 345b; (701), 147b; (871), 146b; (896), 146a; (940), 146b; (1052), 148b; (1057), 146b; (1076), 148b; (1173 Paley), 63a; (1251), 148b

Phoen. (93, 100), 135b; (**208-213**), 13, 14a; (**473-477**, **504**, **703** sq., **740**, **747**, **881-883**), 14a; (**947**), 14b; (**1009**), 349a, 350a; (**1134-1138**, **1193**), 14b; (1224), 349a; (**1233** sq., 1238), 14b

Troad. (147), 171b; (522), 349a; (**726**), 172a fr. (**303**: **401**, **3-5**), 105a; (324, 5 N.), 50b; (537), 52b; (781, 50 N. = 775 D.), 50b; (839), 232a; (901), 52a

fr. *Antiope* (**A. I. 4**), 50a, b; (**II. 8** sq., **10**, **15**, **21**: **B. II. 1**, **15**: **C. II. 38**, **50**, **51**, **70**), 50b

Eusebius:—

H.E. iii. (39), 257b, 419b (n.); iv. (23), 420b; v. (1), 256a; (8), 254b (n.), 419b (n.); (20), 253a, b (n.), 255b; (20, 3), 254b (n.), 419b (n.)

F.

Festus (p. 19), 6b; (s.v. *Maius mensis*), 475a
fragm. adesp. (**458**), 106b

G.

Gaius i. (6), 258b

Gaudentius (p. 5 Meibom), 421b (n.); (p. 23), 178a

Gellius:—

Noct. Att. xiii. (22), 475b; xvi. (10, 5), 308b

Gratian ii. (c. 12, can. xxiii.), 250a

Gregory of Nazianzum (355 B schol. on), 377a

Gregory of Nyssa:—

Dial. de Anima (p. 187), 388b

H.

Herodas vii. (**78**), 239b

Herodotus i. (61), 106a; (132), 428a; (165), 63a; (194), 174a; iii. (48), 298b; (53), 72a; viii. (77 oracle in), 231b

Hesiod:—

Op. et D. (750 sqq.), 392a

Scut. Herc. (178 schol. on), 280a

Theog. (4), 376a; (134), 391a; (382), 392a; (383 sqq.), 281a; (**411-452**), 390 ff.; (956 sqq.), 391b

NO. LXIII. VOL. IX.

Himerius:—

Or. xix. (3), 282a

Homer:—

Iliad i. (67), 394b; (81), 18a (n.); (112, 113), 394a; (117), 393b; (403 sq.), 52b; ii. (155 sqq. schol. on), 251b, 252a; (547), 464b; (597), 221b; (820 sq.), 351b; iii. (41), 393b; iv. (136, 135 sqq., 213 sqq.), 56a; (485, 510), 464b; v. (99, 796 sqq.), 56a; (855), 55b; vi. (46 sqq.), 464a; (**335**), 142b; vii. (21), 393b, 394a; (141, 144), 464b; (182), 393b, 395a; viii. (195), 56a; (204), 293b; ix. (**707**), 142b; x. (93 sqq.), 429a; xi. *init.*, 55b; (79), 393b; (133), 464a; (319), 393b; xii. (174), 393b, 394a; xiii. (1, 16), 311a; (21, 28, 78, 157, 174, 191, 237, 263), 311b; (347), 393b, 394a; (471, 474, 592, 688, 703, 725, 740, 803, 817), 311b; xiv. (120), 395a; (153), 349a; xv. (51), 394a; (125), 55b; (596), 393b; xvi. (121), *ib.*; xvii. (331), 393b, 394a; xix. (274), 395a; xxi. (336), 395a; (385), 433a; xxii. (357), 464a; xxiii. (485), 319b; (594), 393b; (632), 393b, 394a; xxiv. (39, 226), 394a

Odyssey i. (130), 275a (n.); (234), 394b; iii. (34), 311b; (143, 232), 394b; iv. (124), 275a (n.); (275, 353), 394b; v. (169), 395a; ix. (96), 394b; xi. (358, 489), *ib.*; xii. (348 sqq.), 394b, 395b; (350), 394b; xiv. (1), 171b; xv. (21), 394b, 395b; (88), 394b; xvi. (106), *ib.*; (387), 394b, 395b; xvii. (81), 394b; (173), 391a; (228, 404), 394b; (424), 395a; xviii. (364), 394b; xix. (389 sqq., 396 sqq.), 253a; xx. (316), 394b

Homeric Hymns:—

Hymn to Aphrodite (260, 267 sqq.), 90a (n.)

Hymn to Apollo (194), 167b

Hymn to Athena (), 89a

Hymn to Demeter (**22** sq.), 90a (n.); (**227** sqq.), 13a, b

Hymn to Hermes (71), 70b

[See also pp. 415-418.]

Horace:—

Ep. I. i. (65), 348a; xi. (**26** Porphyry on), 130a; xiv. (33), 302a; xx. (**19**), 131b; II. ii. (172), 259a

Epod. ix., 132a; (**17**), *ib.*; (21), 110a; xvii. (**52** Porphyry on), 130b

Od. I. vi. (**28**), 131a; **xii.**, 132b; **xv.**, 131b; xx. (**10**), 130a; xxiii. (**5**), 133b; xxvii. (19), 174b; xxxvi., 41a; xxxvii. (**14**), 133a; II. vii., 41a; ix. (**17-24**), 302 ff.; xi. (1), 303a; (**4**), 131a; xii. (**28**), *ib.*; xiii. (**7**), 132b; xviii. (**20**, **29**), 131b; III. iv. (35), 303a; viii. (**5**), 132a; x. (**10**), 132b; xi., 131a; (**49**), 132a; **xviii.**, 133a; **xix.**, 132a; xxiii. (**16**), 302a, b; xxviii., 131a; IV. ii. (2), 110a; (7), 132a; (33, 41), 110a; (**49**), 110a, b; (53), 110a; viii. (**17**, **24**, **25**), 133a; xi. (**2**), 132a; xii. (23), 302a

Sat. I. i. (8), 259a, 260a; (**108**), 17b, 18a; ii. (2), 156b; iii. (71), 347b; iv. (**14** Porphyry on), 130a; v. (), 428b; vi. (7), 109a; (15 Lambinus on), 246a (n.); x. (21), 16b, 17b; II. ii. (**48** Porphyry on), 130a; iii. (97), 17b; v. (18), 16b

Hyperides (i. 6, 12; iii. 36; iv. 5), 72a (n.); (v. 2, 12, 26), 74a

Against Athenogenes (§ 27), 72a (n.); col. i. (**14**), 72a; viii. (24), *ib.*; ix. (**14**), *ib.*; x. (**17**), 72a, b; xvii. (**6**), 72b

Against Philippides col. i. (**19**), 72b; v. (112), *ib.*; viii. (188), *ib.*; (pp. **53b**, **56**, **58**), 73b

K K

Hyperides, continued—

- Funeral Oration* (§ 27, p. 78, col. iv. ult., x. 7-10), 73b
In Demosthenem col. xxiv. (15), 114b
Lycophr. (§ 14), 73b
Pro Euxenippo (§ 19), 73b
fr. (21), 72a (n.); (219a), 73b
 'Raphael fragments' col. viii. (3-4), 73b; (pp. 11-12 Blass), 73a; col. xxiv. (p. 16), 73b

I. J.

Johannes Lydus:—

- De Magistr.* i. (47), 163a

Josephus:—

- Ant.* i. (6, 1), 476b

- Bell. Jud.* v. (6), 132b

Irenaeus:—

- Refutation of Heresies* i. (*Pref.*), 256a, 420b; (13, 3: 15, 6), 256a; ii. (22, 4), 253b (n.), 257a; (22, 4-6), 255b; (24, 4), 253b (n.), 254b; (32, 2: 35, 3), 255a; iii. (3, 4), 254a (and n.), 255b, 419b (n.); (17, 4), 256a; (20, 4), 255a; (23, 3), 256a; iv. (6, 1: 20, 12: 22, 1), 255a; (27, 1), 256a (and n.); (81, 1), 256a (n.); (32, 1), 256a (n.), b; v. (13, 1), 255a; (30, 1, 3: 33, 3-4), 255b; (35, 1), 255a; (36, 1, 2), 255b

Isaacs (12 § 6), 73a

Isidore:—

- Orig.* xviii. (47), 372a

Isocrates v. (136), 127a; vi. (32), *ib.*; xvi. (44), 126b

- Areop.* (38, 46, 58), 126b

- Paneg.* (126, 151, 153, 180, 187), 126a

- Phil.* (5), 126a; (80, 130, 152), 126b

Julian:—

- Ep. ad Eccl.* (46), 110a, b

Justin Martyr:—

- Tryph.* (91), 255a

Justinian:—

- Cod.* xi. (18), 318a

- Juvenal i. (89), 349a; iii. (100 Mayor on), 198a; iv. (25), 349a; v. (107), *ib.*; vi. (434 *sqq.*), 477a; vii. (113), 348a; (165), 29 f.; (175 *sqq.*), 346a, b; viii. (27), 152a, 346b, 347a; (60, 108 *sqq.*), 347a; (237 *sqq.*, 245), 347a, b; ix. (60), 109a; x. (90 *sqq.*), 347b; xi. (3), 349a; (117 *sqq.*), 348a; xii. (48 *sqq.*), 348a, b; xiii. (208), 348b; xiv. (140 *sqq.*), *ib.*; (152), 349a; (175), 348b; (227 *sqq.*), 349a, b; (228, 241 *sqq.*), 348b

L.

- Livy i. (21, 4), 141a; (24), 156b; (34), 428b; ii. (52, 5), 7b; iii. (27, 7), 259b; (63, 1: 70, 13), 260a; v. (7, 3), 260a, b; ix. (16, 9), *ib.*; (41, 18), 189b; x. (9), 7a; xxi. (14, 3: 33, 10), 260a; (52, 6), 309a; (55, 9), 239b; xxiv. (22, 19), 260a; xxv. (39, 12), 239b; xxvi. (3, 7), 6b, 8a; xxviii. (6, 4), 260a; xxix. (21), 7b; xxxv. (11, 13), 260a; (48), 444b; xxxviii. (8, 11, 18), 443b; xl. (15, 14), 260a, b; xliii. (16), 6b; xliv. (31, 1), 141a; cxxxiv., cxxxv. (*epitt.*), 303a

Lucan:—

- i. (50), 197a; (68), 149a; (82, 93), 153b; (103), 150b; (159), 155b; (168), 199a; (214), 150a; (219), 152a; (235), 154a; (250), 254a, 255b, 149a; (262 *sqq.*), 155b; (288), 194b; (320), 149a, 193a; (322 *sq.*), 193a; (336), 155a; (392), 197b; (406 *sq.*), 152a; (453), 196b; (460 *sqq.*), 194b; (470 *sq.*),

Lucan, continued—

- 154a; (587 *sq.*), 193a; (588), 149a; (681 *sq.*), 193a; (687 *sq.*), 9a
 ii. (30 *sq.*), 193a; (45), 195a; (68), 9b; (108), 81b; (114), 196a; (126 *sqq.*), 149b; (133), 9b; (162), 196a; (214), 195b; (217 *sq.*), 150b; (260), 199a; (286 *sqq.*), 155a; (292), 239b; (300), 194b; (303), 10b; (396 *sqq.*, 416 *sq.*), 193b; (454 *sqq.*), 152a; (473), 150b; (476 *sq.*), 194a; (524), 120b; (541 *sq.*), 194a; (553), 10a; (556), 194a; (609), 10a; (613 *sqq.*), 10b, 194a; (620), 195b; (672 *sq.*), 194a; (707), 152a
 iii. (23), 194a; (149, 240), 194b; (253), 153b; (360), 194a; (388), 152a; (392), 194a; (397), 433; 194b; (549 *sq.*), 152a; (599), 198b; (683 *sq.*), 150b; (729), 155a; (735 *sq.*), 196b
 iv. (40), 194b; (87), 154a; (82), 194b; (89), 194a; (125), 195b; (131), 10a; (134), 193b; (146 *sq.*, 157 *sq.*), 194b; (187 *sq.*), 9a; (219), 194b; (279), 150b, 155b; (283), 194b; (284), 150b, 155b; (304), 9b; (305), 155b; (308), 199a; (329), 10b; (331), 154a; (335), 193b; (371 *sq.*), 151a; (465), 194b, 197b; (503), 195a; (517), 194b; (562 *sqq.*, 589 *sq.*), 195a; (600), 151a; (632), 151b; (696), 197b; (706), 152b; (719, 736), 151a; (743), 10a
 v. (50, 52), 151b; (89), 193a; (107), 10b, 195a; (111), 197b; (136 *sqq.*), 151b; (163), 195a; (189, 210), 10b; (368 *sq.*), 155a; (375), 10a; (383 *sq.*), 151b; (385 *sq.*), 195a; (476), 155a; (529), 152a; (549), 195a; (569 *sqq.*), 152a; (577), 198b; (599 *sqq.*), 152a; (605 *sq.*), 150b, 156a; (612 *sq.*, 619), 195b; (663), 194b; (696 *sq.*), 10b; 194a; (748 *sq.*), 195b
 vi. (7 *sq.*), 155b; (19), 194b; (24), 195b; (64), 194b; (112), 10b; (128), 195b; (145), 155a; (200), 9b, 10a; (225), 151b; (237), 152b; (246), 194b; (261), 152b; (263), 195b; (293), 193a; (330), 10b; (453), 195b; (470), 9b; (496, 508), 10b; (544, 550 *sq.*, 565), 196a; (616 *sq.*), 155a; (650 *sq.*), 196a; (674), 150a; (681 *sq.*), 152b; (699 *sq.*), 153a; (742 *sqq.*, 760), 154a; (783), 9b; (826), 194b
 vii. (15), 155a; (83, 92 *sqq.*), 196b; (122), 195a; (151 *sq.*), 193b; (180 *sqq.*, 183 *sqq.*, 303), 196b; (363, 388, 421, 426), 153b; (444 *sq.*), 150a; (451 *sq.*), 153b; (461 *sqq.*), 154a; (462), 198b; (490), 197a; (502 *sq.*), 154b; (506), 155b; (554), 199a; (562), 152b; (589), 193a, 196b; (594), 154b; (616), 196b; (641), 10b, 197a; (755), 193a; (779), 196b; (815 *sq.*), 197a; (858), 199a
 viii. (41), 196a; (51), 197a; (90), 9a; (141, 142 *sq.*, 157), 197a; (165 *sq.*), 150b, 196b; (203 *sqq.*), 198a; (217), 195a; (223, 245), 150a; (257 *sqq.*), 198a; (285 *sq.*, 293, 327), 197b; (336), 195a; (364), 194b; (370), 10a; (395, 401 *sq.*), 197b; (524), 198a; (526), 199a; (536 *sqq.*), 197b; (539), 9b; (563), 567; 154b; (575), 198a; (665 *sq.*), 197a; (683), 196b; (749), 198a; (757), 194b; (788 *sqq.*), 196a; (844), 152a; (860 *sq.*), 198a
 ix. (8), 151b; (65), 152a; (165), 10b; (196), 194b; (211), 195a; (243), 155a; (288 *sqq.*, 299), 198a; (301 *sq.*, 329), 198b; (332), 193a; (385 *sq.*), 154b; (393 *sq.*), 155a; (403), 199b; (406 *sq.*), 155a; (424 *sqq.*), 198b; (445), 199b; (446), 9b; (448), 197b; (449), 199a; (454), 155b; (461), 199a;

Lucan, continued—

(495), 195a; (556), 199a; (**562**), 199a, b;
(**568**), 199a; (**588**), 155b; (595), 197b;
(626), 10a; (**627**), 199a; (675 sq.), 152b;
(697), 10a; (**714**), 199a; (733), 155a; (734),
199b; (749), 10a; (760), 10b; (**776** sq.),
199a; (795), 10b; (**798**, **821**), 199b; (841),
194b; (**847**, **880** sq.), 199b; (881), 155b;
(913), 153b; (**917**), 199b; (939), 10a; (1025
sq.), 198a; (1034), 197a
x. (59, 63), 9a; (**111** sq.), 199b; (119), 168b;
(**136**), 155b; (**141**), 199b; (177), 150b;
(**244** sq.), 155b; (284), 152a; (384), 155a;
(430), 197b; (457), 197a; (473), 150b; (**536**
sq.), 156b

Lucian:—

d. d. (6 schol. on), 278b
Dialogi Meretricii (1, 2: 6, 3), 72a
Lucilius i. **24** Müller (= 30 Lachm.), 30a, b; xiv.
(21 Müller), 259b

Lucretius i. (**6-9**), 207a, b: (15 Munro on), 210a:
(188 sq.), 210b: (465, **468**), 207b: (**886**), 210a:
(**1000**), 209a: (**1109**), 259b; ii. (**32**), 210a:
(**180**), 210b: (263), 259b: (**357**, **360**), 207b,
208a: (456), 259b: (**681**), 210b: (1006), 259b:
(**1058** sq.), 209a, b: (**1162**), 210a; iii.
(**682** sq.), 209b: (800), 210a: (954, 955, **962**,
963), 156a; iv. (**147**, **152**), 210a: (164, 193, 201,
212), 259b; v. (422 sq.), 209b: (**564**), 210a:
(728), 131a: (1004 Lambinus on), 245b: (**1189**
sq.), 208a; vi. (230), 259b: (**490**, **1195**), 210a.
Lysias (4 § 5), 72b

M.

Macrobius:—

Sat. i. (16), 475a: (23), 70b: (30), 475a; v.
(22), *ib.*

Magna Moralia (1185b 38, 1197b 38), 2a

Manilius i. (27), 154b; ii. (439), 186a

Martial:—

Epigr. v. (6, 5), 324a, 353a; viii. (65), 168a

Menander:—

Incert. (218), 282a

N.

Neophron:—

fr. (**3**), 105b

Nepos:—

Dion. (**1**, **4**), 478b

Epam. (**1**, **4**), 140b

New Testament Writers:—

St. Matthew v. (28), 103a; xi. (**19**), 312a, b:
(27), 255a; xiii. (20), 438a

St. Mark xi. (8), 427b

St. Luke ii. (43), 254a (n.); viii. (51), 254a
(n.); 255a: (54), 254a (n.)

St. John viii. (57), 257a; xi. (47-53), 252a;
xiii. (7), 346a; xiv. (2), 255b (n.): (20),
100b; xvii. (15, 17, 18), 435a

Acts i. (**18**), 258a, b; iii. (3), 446b; iv. 10,
25-28), 252a; v. (3, 26 sq.), 446b; viii. (26),
ib.; ix. (2, 11, 15, 43), *ib.*; xii. (7), *ib.*; xiv.
(3, 5), *ib.*; xix. (30), *ib.*; xx. (24), *ib.*; xxi.
(14, 30, 34), *ib.*; xxvii. (**17**, 18, 38), 429b

Romans viii. (19-23), 206b: (20), 386a

1 Corinthians v. (11), 203b; viii. (10), 102b;

ix. (18), 435a; xiii. (), 103a

Hebrews ix. (11 sq.), 204a; x. (1), 301b; xi.,
103a

Revelation vii. (15), 206b

Nonius Marcellus:—

De Conpendiosa Doctrina (39, 26), 356b (n.);
(**41**, **7**), 357a; (**66**, **14**: **67**, **23**), 356b;
(79, 1: 88, 27, 31: 92, 7: 95, 6: 96, 14),
356b (n.); (**105**, **17**), 357a; (106, 24), 356b
(n.); (**125**, **26**: **169**, **25**), 357a; (171, 15),
356b (n.); (182, 28), 357a (n.); (**185**, **13**:
188, **2**), 357a; (229, 29), 357b (n.); (**230**,
30: **231**, **22**), 356b

[See also pp. 396-403 and 447-454.]

O

Old Testament Writers:—

Deuteronomy x. (17), 298b

Judges iv. (2), 436b; x. (7), *ib.*

1 Chronicles xxix. (11), 388a

Job xvi. (15), 216a

Isaiah xl. (4), 435b; l. (1), 436b

Ezekiel xlv. (9), 104a: (26, 27), 104b

Apocrypha:—

Judith x. (5), 109b

Wisdom of Solomon viii. (6), 339a

Origen:—

c. *Cels.* (p. 245), 203b

Orosius vi. (21, 19), 303a

Ovid:—

Amor. i. (6, 44), 324a: (**7**, **20**), 159a; iii. (12,
22), 478b: (13), 475b: (**15**, **11** sq.), 108a,
109a

Ars Am. i. (332), 478b: (552), 159b: (655 sq.),
158a (n.); ii. (**307** sq.), 75b, 162a

Ex Pont. ii. (**7**, **23** sq.), 162b: (9, 72: 10, 10),
160a; iv. (1, 14), 159b: (9, 86), 108b

Fast. i. (480), 160a; ii. (**719** sq.), 158a; iii.
(192), 108b: (459), 262b: (789 sq.), 352b; iv.
(358 sq.), 13b: (456), 160a

Her. xii. (**73** sq.), 159a

Ibis (**45**, **58**), 161b; (**96**), 162a; (121 sq.),
353a; (**239** sq.), 161b; (458), 158b

Met. i. (48), 153b: (137), 198b; ii. (775 sq.),
353a; v. (192), 352a; vi. (114), 367b: (220),
199a; vii. (263), 199b: (**266** sq.), 152b,
153a: (347), 155b; viii. (454), 89b: (**819**),
239a

Rem. Am. (228), 160a; (**476**), 158b; (535),
151a; (582), 160a

Trist. i. (3, 23), 81b: (**6**, **6**), 159b; ii. (104,
208), 160a; iii. (**10**, **9** sq.), 159b

P.

Paulus (p. 92, l. 16), 475a; *cx* Fest. (p. 44 Müll.),
367b; (p. 143 Müll.), 302b

Pausanias i. (28, 6), 279b: (33, 7), 93b: (42, 3),
282a: (43, 1), 391b; ii. (**1**), 95a: (10, 3), 113b:
(30, 2), 392b; v. (14, 6), 282a: (17, 9), 93b: (26,
6), 283a; vi. (20, 6), 374a; vii. (5 sq.), 443a;
viii. (30, 2), 68b, 371a: (38, 7), 68b; x. (29, 7),
95a; (31, 7), 255b (n.)

Petronius (28), 260a; (132), 199b

Phaedrus:—

Fab. iv. (23, 17), 443b

Pherekrates:—

fr. (112 Kock), 234b; *fr. incert.* (63), 370b

Philo i. (26), 253b (n.)

De Mundo (p. 606 M.), 389a

Leg. All. i. (p. 43), 340b

Philodemus:—

[Teubner ed.]—(p. 20, col. i.-ii.), 358b; (p.
27, **1-4**: p. **43**, col. xviii.-xix.: p. 49:
p. 102, 32: p. 110, 33: p. **167**, **2-7**: p.

Philodemus, *continued*—

185), 359a; (p. 192, 1-4: p. 127: p. 235, col. vi. 8-10: p. 327, fr. ix.: p. 346), 359b

περὶ εὐσεβείας (p. 84 Gomp.), 34a

Philostrophus:—

Vit. Apoll. ii. (20=p. 32 Kayser), 301b

Vit. Soph. ii. (3), 427b

Phlegon:—

Mir. (1), 249b

Pindar:—

Isth. ii. (26), 281a; iii. [iv.] (41), 12a, b

Nem. iii. (7, 56), 12a: (82), 11b; iv. (67 sq.), 11a, 12a; v. (42), 281a; viii. (3), 12b

Ol. ix. (2), 110b

Pyth. i. (179), 149b; ii. (30), 278b; iii. (113), 12b; ix. (60), 167b

Plato:—

Apol. (18 D), 148a; (20 D, 21 B), 147b; (25), 147a; (32 A), 147b

Charm. (155 B), 147a; (167 B), 146b; (176 C), 148b

Epp. vii. (341), 205a

Euthyphro (6 E, 9 A), 148a; (14 C), 370a

Gorg. (447 C, 448 B, D, 449 D, 450 C, 451 A), 147a; (453 A), 147b; (455 D), 148a; (457 D), 73b; (458 E), 147a, b; (462 B, 463 C, 475 E), 147a; (482 A), 147b, 148a; (497 C), 147a; (506 C), 147a, b; (507 A), 148a; (522 E), 147a; (523 A), 147b

Lach. (184 A), 349b; (190 C), 148b; (190 D, 201 C), 146b; (197 D), 148a

Laws (632 C), 456b; (637 C, 652 A, B), 147b; (658 E), 97b (n.); (714 A), 387a; (731 A), 440a; (803 C), 388a; (844), 244b; (873 B), 250a; (873 D, E), 250b; (897), 386a; (955), 205a

Minos (315 D), 249b

Parmenides (126 B), 316b; (127 B, C, 128 B), 314a; (129 D), 313b; (130 C), 314a; (130 D), 316b; (130 E sqq.), 315b; (131 A), 313b; (131 B), 313b, 314a; (131 C, 132 B), 313b; (132 C), 313a; (133 B), 314a; (135 B), 313b; (137 A, C), 316b; (137 D, E, 138 A), 313b; (141 C, D), 314a; (143 B), 313b, 314a; (146 B), 313b; (149 B), 313a; (149 D), 314a; (150 B), 313a, b; (150 C, 152 A), 313b; (154 E, 155 A), 314b; (155 D), 317b; (156 D, 157 B, C), 314b; (158 B), 314a; (159 A), 314b; (159 C), 313b; (163 A, B), 314b; (163 E, 164 C, E), 313b; (165 A), 314a; (165 B, C), 313b, 314a; (166 A), 313b

Phaedo (70 D), 73b; (76 E), 313b; (81), 104b; (89 D sqq.), 316a; (107), 99b

Phaedr. (250 B), 206b; (264 B), 313b

Phil. (16 B), 316b; (17), 80b, 81a; (66 B), 477a

Protag. (318 E), 175a; (347), 175b

Rep. (415 A), 455b; (451), 100a; (577 C, 585 C), 146b; (601 C-602 A), 456b

Soph. (249 A), 314b

Symp. (179 B), 73b; (194 B), 134b; (215 B), 66b

Theat. (148 B), 72b

Timaeus (29 C), 148a; (37 B, 42 A, E), 3b (n.); (51 B sqq.), 317a, 477a; (53 C), 3b (n.)

Plautus:—

Amph. (235), 16b; (i. 1, 252), 17b; (697), 17a; (iii. 3, 13: iv. 3, 4), 18a

Asin. (419), 16b; (884), 16a

Bacch. (91), 17b; (ii. 8, 98), 17a; (561), 17b; (v. 2, 56), 30b

Capl. (857), 15b; (923), 429a

Plautus, *continued*—

Cist. (ii. 1, 36), 428b; (653), 16a; (675), 16b

Cura. (139), 16a; (209), 16b; (701), 17a

Epid. (73), 16a; (541, 575), 15b; (717), 16b

Men. (144), 367b; (v. 2, 119), 30a

Merc. (prol. 62), 16a; (573 [565]), 16b

Mil. Gl. (13), 17a; (57), 17b; (62), 17a; (309, 565), 16a; (614), 16b; (936), 16a; (972, 973, 984), 17a

Most. (362, 396), 17b; (508), 15b; (556), 16b; (580), 15a; (738 [724]), 16b; (850), 16a; (887), 16a, 17b; (955), 15b; (v. 1, 53), 30b

Pers. (120), 478b; (220), 15b

Poen. (421), 16a; (v. 2, 87), 428b

Pseud. (106, 278, 309), 309b; (371), 16a

Rud. (272), 16b, 17a; (538), 16b; (767), 16b, 17a; (861), 17a; (909), 429a; (1019), 17a; (1231), 16b

Stich. (501), 16b; (625), 15b

Trin. (129, 136), 15a, 17b; (ii. 2, 69 sqq.), 302b; (336), 309b; (360), 17a; (634), 15b; (642 sqq.), 307 ff.; (928), 367b

Trucul. (228, 534), 16b

Pliny:—

Hist. Nat. iii. (20, 136), 304a; vii. (51), 260a, b; xxxii. (6, 21), 334a

Pliny:—

Epp. ii. (9), 442a; iv. (30, 8), 156b

Paneg. (56), 260b

Plutarch:—

Alex. (64), 299a

Artax. (2), 429a

Comp. Dem. et Cic. (3), 73a

De Musica (pp. 13, 14 Westphal), 424b

Mor. (800 B), 365b

Per. (1, 4: 1, 13: 2, 1: 4, 3: 4, 4), 365a; (5, 1), 365b; (7, 1), 365a; (15, 4), 364b; (15 ad fin.: 18, 2: 24, 2), 365a; (24, 5), 365b

Rom. Quaest. (5), 249a; (86), 475a

Sull. (29, 5), 441b

Pseudo-Plutarch:—

περὶ τοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς ποιήσεως 'Ομήρου (ii. c. 120), 252b

Pollux:—

iv. (105), 374a: (123), 371b, 375a, 378a: (127), 135b; vi. (90), 371b; vii. (91), 372a; viii. (120), 250b; (132), 378a; x. (101), 371b; (156), 174b

Polybius:—

i. (10, 3), 128a; (11, 1: 12, 4 Schweighaeuser on), 232a, 234b; ii. (39), 219b; iii. (74, 1), 239b; (113-116), 128b; iv. (35, 4), 371a; v. (48, 4), 427b; vi. (14), 7a; xxi. (43, 9), 128a

Polycarp:—

Phillip. (7), 420b

Pomponius Mela:—

i. (9, 53), 156b

Porphyryon:—

De Antr. (20), 70b

Pratinas:—

fr. (i. 1-2), 375a

Proclus:—

Comm. in pr. Eucl. Element. lib. (Friedlein p. 20, l. 10: 32, 4: 33, 25: 52, 20), 3b (n.); (59, 11), 3b; (108, 10: 192, 10: 291, 1: 382, 3), 3b (n.)

Propertius:—

I. i. (12), 305b; (14), 25b, 182b (n.); (36), 324a; ii. (13), 324a, 351a; iv. (26), 324a; v. (7), 353a; (27), 22b (n.); ix. (32), 353a; xii. (10), 351a; xv. (21), 324a; (39), 195b; xvi. (23), 324a; xvii. (28), 3b; xviii. (27), 3b; xix. (10), 26a, 182b; (13), 324a; xx. (3, 4), 3b; (8), 26a, 182b; (12), 324a; xxi. (5, 6, 9), 323b

II. i. (10), 353a; (47), 324a; ii. (4, 6), 3b;

Propertius continued—

- vi. (5, 41), *ib.*; vii. (15, 16), *ib.*: (18) 353a; (20), 350b; ix. (12), 324a: (44), 324a, 351a; x. (11), 22a: (23), 324a; xi. (1), 181a; xii. (6), 324a; xiii. (38), *ib.*: (47 sq.), 182b, 443b: (55), 324a, 350b; xv. (14), 352a: (26), 22a: (37), 324a; xvii. (11), 324a, 353a; xviii. (10, 29), 324a; xix. (18), *ib.*: (26), 26a, 182b; xx. (8, 35), 324a; xxi. (5, 7), 26b: (12), 324a; xxii. (12), 20b: (17 sq.), 324a, 353b: (22), 179a (n.): (30), 19b: (50), 19b, 21b, 27b; xxiii. (22, 23), 324a, 350b; xxiv. (1), *ib.*: (4a, 8), 324a: (45 sq.), 26a, 178b (n.), 182a; xxv. (7), 19a: (17), 19b, 324a: (43), 324a; xxvi. (57), 19b: xxvii. (31=11, 49), 324a; xxviii. (7), *ib.*; xxviii. (9), 27a (n.), 179b (n.): (22), 353a: xxviii. (62), 324b; xxix. (1, 7, 21), *ib.*: (27), 324b, 351a; xxx. (19), 20b, 25b: (20), 324b, 351b: (26), 25b, 184b (and n.): (36), 25b, 182b (and n.); xxxiii. (2, 5), 324b: (8), 20a (n.), b, 179a, b: (13), 19b: (16, 23), 324b: (33 sq.), 351b, 352a: (35), 324b: (37), 19b, 20b; xxxiii. (8), 324b: (43), 21b, 181a; xxxiv. (1), 324b: (4), 20a: (13 sq.), 324b, 351a: (29), 324b, 353b: (39), 352a: (45), 353b: (53), 19b, 27b, 185b: (55), 26b: (63), 27b, 182b, 185b
- III. i. (22), 322b: (27), 27b, 185b: (38), 26b; ii. (1 sq.), 25a, b, 184a, b: (14), 323a; iii. (5 sq.), 163b, 323a: (11), 21b, 180b: (21), 26b: (22), 22a: (24), 20b: (45), 355a: (52), 19b; iv. (1 sq.), 304b: (22), 19b (n.), 26b, 178b (n.), 182a; v. (35), 27b, 28a, 183a, 185b: (39), 27b, 185b; vi. (39), 19b: (41), 20a (n.); vii. (21 sq.), 443a: (60), 353a: (68), 20a; viii. (11), 182b; ix. (9), 323a: (11), 19b: (33 sq.), 304b: (35), 27b: (37 sq.), 352b; x. (17 sq.), 27b; xi. (14), 20a: (23), 19b: (34 sq.), 353b: (41), 19b: (56), 351a: (58), 26b, 27b, 351a; xii. (43), 19b (n.); xiii. (27), 20a: (39 sq.), 351b; xiv. (19 sq.), 27a, 180a (n.), 184b: xv. (33), 19a; xvi. (16), 353a; xvii. (1 sq.), 352b: (17), 20a (n.): (37), 346b; xviii. (15), 19b; xix. (6), 20a (and n.), 21a, 350b: (19 sq.), 352a: (21), 346b, 353a: (27), 25b; xx. (17), 179a; xxi. (11), 22a: (19 sq.), 351b; xxiv. (38), 21a
- IV. i. (18 sq.), 353a: (57), 351a: (93), 350a: (103), 19a; ii. (12), 350b: (19), 19b; iii. (7), 27b, 185b: (9), 26b: (11), 19b: (24), 307b: (37 sq.), 444a, b: (51), 179b (n.); iv. (1, 15, 29, 81, 93), 322b; v. (35), 179b (n.); vi. (3), 355a: (25), 21b: (40), 19b: (49), 264b: (68), 353b; vii. (3 sq.), 355a: (10), 353a: (25), 19a, 21a, 180b: (57), 323b: (65), 19b: (85), 352a: (92), 20a; viii. (8, 11), 323a: (31, 58), 25b, 27b: (72), 352b; ix. (3), 351a: (45), 22a: (64), 20b; x. (19), 351a: (41 sq.), 20a, 168a, 352a, b; xi. (16), 26a, 182b: (20), 21b: (64, 68), 26b: (101), 351a: (102), 350b
- Pseudo-Euclid (p. 1), 421b (n.); (p. 9), 422b (n.); (p. 12), 422a (n.), 424b; (p. 14), 422; (p. 17), 424a (n.)
- Ptolemy (Claudius) iii. (1, 2), 304a
- Harmonics ii. (4), 424a (n.): (16), 468b
- μετ. συν. (προοίμιον, *init.*), 1a; (p. Halma), 2a
- Python:—
fr. (1), 106b

Q.

Quintilian:—

Inst. Orat. ii. (15, 6, 9), 358b; xii. (10, 7), 237a

S.

Sallust:—

Cat. (19), 258a; (51), 7a; (55), 308b
Hist. (iv. 26 Dietsch), 303b
Jug. (103), 258a

Seneca:—

Epp. v. (9, 3), 259b
H. F. (540 [536]), 324b, 351b
Hipp. (62), 367b
Nat. Quaest. ii. (4: 6), 389a; iii. (27, 10: 28, 3), 131b; v. (18, 8), 353b
Oed. (903 sq.), 305a
Phaedr. (963 [955]), 154a

Sextus Empiricus:—

Adv. Mathem. vii. (55), 34a

P. H. i. (92), 301b

Silius Italicus:—

Punic. i. (641), 150a: (674), 193b; iii. (408), 153b; iv. (543), 352a; vii. (160), 195a; viii. (383 sq.), 150a: (441), 149b; xii. (448), 22a

Sophocles:—

Ai. (127 sq.), 149b; (384 schol. on), 240b
Ant. (1), 15b; (31 sq. Campbell on), 439a, b; (117 sq.), 15a, b; (148), 283b; (162-331 Jebb and Semitelos on), 439b; (177), 440a; (178 Jebb and Blaydes on), 439b, 440a; (184, 191, 192), 440a; (411 Jebb on), 349a; (580 sq.), 440b; (673), 477a; (795 sq.), 441a, b; (806 sq.), 440b; (904 sq.), 212a; (1001 sq.), 52b; (1203), 14b
El. (35, 47, 165, 343), 211b; (393), 221a; (437, 454), 211b; (548), 221a; (651 sq., 763, 769, 826, 887), 211b; (950), 319b; (1037, 1145, 1220, 1349 sq.), 211b

O. C. (481), 49a

O. T. (80 sq.), 52a; (240), 120b; (709 sq.), 252b; (1002 sq.), 251b

Phil. (22 sq.), 53a; (96 sq.), 201b; (100), 53b; (134 schol. on), 282a (n.), 283b; (343), 171a; (733, 753), 53b; (782), 53a; (917), 53b; (1076 sq. Jebb on), 349b, 350a, b; (1079), 319b; (1093), 363a, b; (1097, 1118, 1188, 1213), 53b

Trach. (4), 211b; (26-48), 200 ff.; (56), 211b (n.), 395b; (88, 112), 211a; (145), 363a; (188, 195), 211a; (196), 63a; (229, 307 sq., 308 sq.), 211b; (497 sq., 523 sq.), 200b; (526, 564), 211b; (825), 201a; (869, 1016), 211a: (1226), 211b

fr. (86, 87 D.), 50a; (132 D.), 49b; (162 D.), 50a; (179 Nauck,² 215), 103a; (377 D.), 50a

Sosiphanes:—

fr. (1), 106b

Sositheus (2), 106b

Statius:—

Silv. i. (6, 44), 81a, b; iii. (3, 163), 10a: (5, 69), 324a

Theb. v. (550), 108a, 109b; (604), 149a

Strabo ix. (p. 399), 352a; xii. (3, 41), 96b; xiv. (639), 443a

Suetonius:—

Aug. (7), 367b

Dom. (9), 45a

Iul. (2), 303b

Nero (45), 109 f.

T.

Tacitus:—

Agr. (3), 45a; (24), 310 f.

Ann. i. (64), 429b; iii. (54 Nipperdey on) 199b; xi. (23), 441a

Tacitus, continued—

Dial. (1, 15), 47b; (2, 15), 48a; (3, 20), 47b; (6 ad fin.), 48b; (7, 3, 13, 8, 30: 9, 20: 10, 14, 20, 25, 37), 47b; (11, 9), 46a; (11, 16: 13, 14, 24: 15, 5), 47b; (17, 10), 47a; (18, 6: 19, 4), 47b; (21, 28), 48a; (22, 22: 24, 10), 47b; (24, 14), 47a; (25, 8), 46b; (25, 11: 27, 7: 28, 16: 29, 9: 32, 15, 28: 33, 18: 34, 33), 47b; (36, 2), 48a; (37, 18, 38), 47b; (38 init.), 48b; (38, 5, 19: 39, 9), 47b

Germ. (1, 1), 327b; (2, 2), 329a; (2 ad fin.), 327b; (3: 5), 329b; (7, 2), 328b; (7, 3), 328a; (8 ad fin.), 328b; (9), 329b; (10), 330b; (11), 329b; (11, 3: 14, 4: 16, 3, 4), 328a; (17), 329b; (20), 330b; (22), 329b; (22 ad fin.), 328a, 329b; (27, 3: 33, 2), 327a; (34, 1), 328b; (35, 1), 329a; (38, 1), 328b; (40, 2), 329a; (43 ad fin.), 328b; (44, 3: 45, 1), 329a; (45, 6), 328b

Hist. i. (88), 328a; ii. (62), *ib.*

Terence—

Adelph. (261), 16b; (770), 16a; (841), 239a
Andr. (478, 683), 16a; (768), 16b
Eum. (931), 16a
Heaut. (950), 16a
Phorm. (184), 259a; (923), 17a; (969), 16a

Tertullian—

Ad Nat. i. (149), 351b

Theocritus—

Idyll. i. (105), 351b; xvii., 60a, b; xviii. (38), 52a; xx. (34 sq., 40), 351b

Theodoret (p. 88), 387b

Theon of Alexandria—

Comm. on Ptolemy's $\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (p. 1 Basle ed. = p. 3 ad fin. Halma), 1a; p. 4 Halma), 4a

Theophylact (b. 195), 258a

Thucydides i. (9, 3), 73b; (25), 361a; (33, 2), 147b; (39 ad fin.), 361b; (42, 1), 148a, b; (43, 3), 148a; (73), 361b; (78, 1: 82, 4: 83, 2), 148a; (85, 3), 148b; (86, 4), 148a; (86, 5), 147b; (90, 3 Shilleto on), 445a; (124, 1), 147b; (128, 9), 148b; (134), 68b; (143, 6), 147b; (144, 2), 148b; ii. (15, 2), 477b; (49), 430a; (72, 6), 148b; (76, 3), 478a; (89, 13), 148a; iii. (13, 5: 14, 1), 148a; (36), 360b; (39, 9: 46, 2: 47, 1: 58, 6: 62, 3), 147b; (67, 6), 148a; (70), 361b; iv. (18, 4), 148a; (63, 1: 87, 4: 95, 3), 148b; (118, 6), 148a; (118, 12: 119, 1), 30a; v. (5), 232a; (10), 63a; (11), 361b; (16), 68b; (19, 1), 30a; (111, 6), 147b; vi. (2), 56b; (3), 57a; (8), 72a; (11, 2-3), 309 f.; (14, 1), 147b, 360b; (22, 1), 148a; (32), 349b, 350a; (34, 1, 9), 148b; (54 sqq.), 430b; (80, 5), 147b; vii. (2, 4: 7, 1, 3), 263a; (13, 2), 263b; (28, 3), 263a; (31, 4), 263b; (39), 63a; (41, 1: 43, 2), 263b; (55, 1), 441a; (63, 5), 148a; (65) 65b; (68, 1), 148a; (71, 5), 63a; (75, 4), 263b; (77, 4), 148b; (77, 6), 148a; viii. (67), 126b

Tibullus i. (1, 2), 77a, 108 f.; (1, 5), 109a; (1, 14), 109b; (1, 19 sq.), 109a; (1, 25), 76b; (1, 37), 109a; (1, 41), 77a, 109a; (1, 43), 76b; (2, 19), 77a; (2, 25), 74a; (2, 58), 77a; (3 title), 78b; (3, 4), 76b; (3, 12), 78b; (3, 50), 75a, b; (3, 55), 78a; (3, 75), 108b; (4, 44), 74a, 75a; (5, 33, 47), 74a, 75b; (5, 69 sqq., 74), 77a; (6, 7), *ib.*; (6, 42), 74a, 75b; (6, 72), 74a, 75a; (7, 49), 76b; (7, 56), 74a, 75b; (9, 19), 78b; (9, 23 sq.), 77a; (9, 40), 76b; (9, 83), 78a; (10,

Tibullus, continued—

25), 74b; ii. (1, 58), 74b, 75b, 76a; (1, 67), 76b; (1, 79), 76a; (2, 21), 74b, 76a; (3, 11 sqq.), 351b; (3, 14a, b), 74b; (3, 14 c), 74b, 75a; (3, 34), 74b, 75b; (3, 42), 108b; (3, 59), 77a; (3, 74), 74b; (4, 22), *ib.*; (4, 29), 76a; (4, 36), 77a; (4, 37 sq.), 74b, 76a; iii. (2, 24), 76b; (3, 5), 108b; (4, 4), 76b; (4, 64 sqq.), 74b, 76b; (5, 11), 77a; (5, 17-20), 77b; (6, 3), 77a; (6, 21), 76b; (6, 23), 74b, 76b; iv. (1, 40), 76b; (1, 82), 78b; (1, 112a, 205), 76b; (4, 11, 71-74), 77a; (5, 16), 76b; (7, 4), 77a; (12, 2), 78b; (13, 8), 77a; (14, 13 sq.), 77b

Timaeus (ap. Athen. xii. 523 E), 219b; (ap. Phot. fr. 77 Müller), *ib.*

Timotheus Alexandrinus (ap. Blastaris *Syntagma* B. xii.), 250a

V.

Valerius Flaccus—

Argonautica i. (639 sq.), 152a; ii. (641), 113b; iii. (191), 113a; iv. (589), 10a; v. (453), 168b; vii. (156), 113b; viii. (158), 113a.

Varro—

Mysteria vii. (p. 174 Riese), 259b
Rer. Rust. ii. (5, 5), 476b
Sat. Menipp. (*Eumen.* 16 sq.), 156b
Sat. fr. (25), 476b

Velleius ii. (46), 258a; (127 sq.), 347b

Venantius Fortun. vi. (1, 105), 167b

Vergil—

Aen. i. (104), 198b; (214), 151a; (393 sqq., 703), 54a; ii. (62), 429b; (74), 54a; (337), 9a; (493), 54a; iii. (113), 306a; (121), 168a; (260), 155b; (274), 168a; (557), 9b; (684 sqq.), 54b; iv. (173 sqq.), 168a; (256, 459), 54b; (534 sqq., 538), 17a; (689), 54b; v. (744), 351a; vi. (118 Servius on), 153a; (567, 603, 615, 743, 882), 54b; vii. (464), 199b; viii. (246), 154a; (465), 156b; (605), 109a; ix. (368), *ib.*; (399), 347b; (646 sq.), 197a; x. (673), 17a; xii. (260), 347b; (605), 367b

Catalepton [57], 3: 10[8], 10: 14[6], 9, 366b

Cir. (120), 367a, b; (180, 321, 472), 344b

Copa (25, 28), 367b; (33), 367a

Cul. (5, 37), 366b; (56), 367a; (61), 366b; (67), 367a; (88), 366a; (117, 119), 366b; (137), 366a; (139), 367a

Ecl. iv. (6), 477a

Georg. i. (215 sq.), 199a; (428), 153b; iii. (12 sqq., 32), 304a; (38), 279a; (261), 367b; (391), 70b (n.); iv. (127), 109a; (244 Conington on), 302b

Vitruvius v. (4), 338b

X.

Xenophon—

Anab. iii. (4, 41 sq.), 395b; iv. (8, 20), 429a; vi. (6, 24), 148a
Cyrop. viii. (8, 16), 275a
Hellen. iv. (8, 24), 239a; vii. (1, 16), 427b
Mem. i. (5, 1), 141b; ii. (6, 1), *ib.*; (6, 9), 477b
Occ. iii. (11), 365a

III.—GREEK INDEX.

A.

αἰγίλιψ, 477b
αἰολίας, 12b
αἰτίαν ἔχειν, 361a (n.)
ἀκέραιος (Suid. s.v.), 429a
ἀμφιβρότη, 55b
ἀναψηφίζειν, 360b, 361a
ἀνόστεος, 13b
ἀντίγραφα Ἀττικιανὰ, 313a
ἀόριστος, 342b (n.)
ἀπυκνος, 421b
ἄς (Mod. Greek), 18a
ἀσκοπήτρα (Suid. s.v.), 109b
ἀφ' ἵππων μάχεσθαι, 350a

B.

βαρύπυκνος, 421b
βούλομαι (ἐθέλω, 393a, b
βοῦς (Skt. *gāus*), 116a
βραχυκέφαλος, 12b
βωμός (τράπεζα) and θυμέλη, 370 ff.

Γ.

γαφάγας, 13b
γενή (*γενεσῆ), γένος, 116a
γλαῦξ (γλαυκός, *ib.*)
γραφὴ ξενίας, 307a

Δ.

δασυλλίς, 12b
δασύπους, *ib.*
δευτερότομος (Hesych. s.v.), 249a
δῶ, 116a

E.

ἔδραμον (δραμῶ), 320b
ἐθέλω (βούλομαι, 393a, b
= δύναμαι, 393a
εἰ (αι), orig. of, 18b
εἰ δ' ἄγε, 18a, b
εἴπα, ἤνεγκα (ἔθηκα, ἔδωκα, ἤκα, 320b
ἐκ (ἀπό) of position, 349 f.
ἐκ περιτελείας, 253b
ἐκατηβόλος (of Hecate), 392a

ἐμαυτός, 37b, 232b, 234b
ἐναγώνιος (of Hermes), 393b
ἐνοδία (of Hecate), *ib.*
ἐνσελεῖν τινα εἰς ὤνην, 74a
ἐπεσον, 320b
ἐπηλυσίη, 13a
ἐρυθρίνος, 12b
ἐρυθρόνιον, *ib.*
ἐρυσίσκηπτρον, *ib.*

Z.

Ζεύς (Skt. *dyāus*), 116a
(υγόν)(νεόζυξ, *ib.*)

Θ.

θέλω (θελήσω), etc., 320b
θερίδιον, 110a, b
θερίζω, 110b
-θι (imperat.), 320a
θρήνυς, 266a
θυμέλη and βωμός (τράπεζα), 370 ff.
and λογείον, 375a
and σκηνή, *ib.*
(Et. Magn. s.v.), 371b, 375a
(Hesych. s.v.), 372a
θάρηξ, 55 f.
θωρήσσειν, 56b

I.

ἰδρις, 13b, 391a
ἱερίτιν (Hesych. s.v.), 280a
ἱκρία, 472a
ἱππεύς, 161b
ἵστασθαι πρὸς τινας, 349a

K.

καλοκαγαθία, 4b
κανονίζειν, 318a, b
κατατέμνειν τινα, 74a
κατέχεσον, 320b
κλοπός (κλώψ), 116a
κνημίδες, 56b
κοπίς, 427b, 428a
κουροτρόφος (of Hecate), 391a, 392a
κύανος, 12b

κύκλιος χορός, 376a
 κύκλοι (of the shield), 55a
 κυριακὰ λόγια, 419a
 κυριακός, 420b
 λαμβάνειν ἐπὶ + acc. (= 'to multiply'), 341a
 λογέιον = προσκήνιον, 471b
 λόγια = γραφαί, 420a

M.

Μάκρων, 12b
 μέλισσα (= μέλι), 49a
 μέλω (μελήσω), etc., 320b
 μέσοι (οἱ), 361a
 μεσόπυκνος, 421b
 μετάβασις (περιπέτεια), 251a
 μετόπι, 53b
 μήτηρ, 56b
 Μουνογένεια, 393a

N.

naūs, 116a

Ξ.

ξιφίας, 12b

O.

ὀξόπυκνος, 421b
 ὀφείλω (ὀφειλήσω), etc., 320b
 ὄψις (= 'stage scenery'), 301a

Π.

παιδαγωγεῖν, 74a
 Παρμενίδης, 313b
 πατήρ, 116a
 περιπέτεια, 251 ff.
 περισκυλακισμός, 392a
 πλεῦμων (πνεύμων), 460a
 πορφύριον, 12b
 πραγματίαν, πραγματιάζειν, 313b
 πρίν, 62b, 63a
 προσπερικόπτειν, 74a
 πτερύγων ἐρετμοῖσι, 265b
 Πύγελα (Et. Magn. s.v.), 443a
 πυκνόν, 421b

Σ.

σκηνή (Suid. s.v.), 375a, 377a
 σολοικίζειν, 319a
 σπουδαῖος (in Aristotle), 214a
 στιβάδες, 274b, 427b, 428a
 στιβάς ἐξ ὕλης, 428a
 στοίχος, 266b
 στρωμή, 274b, 427b, 428a
 στρωμνὰ = lectisternia, 274b, 427b
 συνόδους, 12b
 σχόλια ἀπὸ φωνῆς, 318b

Τ.

τάσος, 265b
 τεθνᾶναι, 459a
 τετράγωνος χορός, 376a
 τεχνικοί (οἱ), 318a
 τράπεζα (βωμός) and θυμέλη, 370 ff.
 (Et. Magn. s.v.), 372b
 (Pollux s.v.), 373b
 τριήρης, 265b
 τρόπος (= 'scale'), 421b

Τ.

ύλομήτρα (Hesych. s.v.), 13b
 ύλοτόμος, 13a, b
 ύπηρέσιον, 429b
 ύποστρωννύειν, 275a (n.)
 ύποταμόν, 13b
 ύποφορά (ύπόφορος), 105a
 ύστερον πρότερον, 54b
 ύστερόποτος (Hesych. s.v.), 249a

Φ.

φάλοι, 56b
 φερέοικος, 13b, 391a
 φόρος (φῶρ), 116a

Ψ.

ψευδομαρτυρία (-ιον), 72b, 73a

Ω.

ωρα (= 'span of life'), 339b

The Classical Review

GENERAL LIBRARY,
UNIV. OF MICH.
23 DEC 1895

CONTENTS

PAGE	PAGE
J. B. MAYOR. Critical Notes on the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria, Book VII. (<i>concluded</i>)	433
M. L. EARLE. Miscellanea Critica	439
H. F. PELHAM. The Emperor Claudius and the Chiefs of the Aedui	441
R. ELLIS. Geographical Notes on Propertius	443
J. DONOVAN. German Opinion on Greek Jussives (<i>concluded</i>)	444
J. WOOD BROWN. The Corrections in the Florence MS. of Nonius	447
REVIEWS:	
Susemihl's and Hicks' edition of the <i>Politics</i> . J. A. STEWART	454
Smyth's <i>Ionian Dialect</i> . P. GILES	457
Buck's <i>Oscan-Umbrian Verb System</i> . H. OERTEL	460
Cooper's <i>Word-Formation in the Roman Sermo Plebeius</i> . H. W. HAYLEY	462
REVIEWS—Continued.	
Cauer on the Groundwork of Homeric Criticism. W. LEAF	463
Wattenbach, Introduction to Greek Palaeography. F. G. KENYON	465
Wachsmuth's Introduction to the Study of Ancient History. F. HAVERFIELD	466
ARCHAEOLOGY:	
American School of Classical Studies in Rome	467
Weil and Reinach's Edition of the Second Delphian Hymn. D. B. MONRO	467
Navarre on the Greek Theatre. A. E. HAIGH	470
Foucart on the Eleusinian Mysteries. E. E. SIKES	473
W. WARDE FOWLER. Was the Flaminica Dialis Priestess of Juno?	474
CECIL TORR. <i>Ancient Ships (a reply)</i>	476
SUMMARIES	477
BIBLIOGRAPHY	478

London: DAVID NUTT, 270 AND 271, STRAND.

Boston:

GINN AND COMPANY, 7, 9, AND 13, TREMONT PLACE.

ENTERED AT THE POST-OFFICE AT BOSTON, MASS., AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

Price for Single Numbers, One Shilling and Sixpence (35 cents), except the February Number which is Three Shillings (70 cents).
Yearly Subscription (Nine Numbers), Twelve Shillings (\$3.00), or Thirteen Shillings and Sixpence, Post Free.

MR. EDWARD ARNOLD'S LIST OF
MESSRS. GINN & Co.'s PUBLICATIONS

**THE COLLEGE SERIES
OF LATIN AUTHORS.**

Edited under the Supervision of Professor C. L. SMITH, Harvard University; and Professor TRACY PECK, Yale University, on lines similar to those of the College Series of Greek Authors.

HORACE: ODES AND EPODES. By Prof. C. L. SMITH. 7s. 6d.

HORACE: SATIRES AND EPISTLES. By Prof. J. B. GREENOUGH. 6s. 6d.

CICERO: BRUTUS, SEU DE CLARIS ORATORIBUS. By Prof. KELLOGG. 6s. 6d.

TACITUS: ANNALS. Books I.-VI. By Prof. ALLEN. 7s. 6d.

LIVY: Books I. and II. By Prof. J. B. GREENOUGH. 6s. 6d.

LIVY: Books XXI. and XXII. By Prof. J. B. GREENOUGH and Prof. TRACY PECK. 6s. 6d.

CATULLUS. By Professor ELMER TRUESDELL MERRILL, of Wesleyan University. 6s. 6d.

TACITUS: DIALOGUS DE ORATORIBUS. By Prof. C. E. BENNETT. 3s. 6d.

ALLEN AND GREENOUGH'S LATIN GRAMMAR. A Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges, founded on Comparative Grammar. By J. H. ALLEN, Lecturer at Harvard University, and J. B. GREENOUGH, Professor of Latin at Harvard University. New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 488 pp., crown 8vo, half-morocco, 6s.

THE GATE TO CÆSAR. By W. C. COLLAR, Author of "Practical Latin Composition," etc. 153 pages. Cloth, 2s.

THE BEGINNER'S LATIN BOOK. By WILLIAM C. COLLAR, A.M., and M. GRANT DANIEL, A.M. Crown 8vo, cloth, 2s.

P. CORNELII TACITI DIALOGUS DE ORATORIBUS. Edited by Dr. ALFRED GUDEMANN, Professor of Classical Philology, University of Pennsylvania. With Prolegomena on the Dialogus, Controversy, Sources, Style, Syntax, Rhetoric, MSS. complete critical apparatus, critical and exegetical commentary, exhaustive Bibliography and Indexes. 12s.

PRACTICAL LATIN COMPOSITION. By W. C. COLLAR, Author of "The Beginner's Latin Book," etc. 268 pages. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s. A Key, 2s. 6d., on Teachers' order only.

CÆSAR:—GALLIC WAR, BOOKS I.-VII. Edited with Notes, Introductions, and Vocabulary, by Professors ALLEN and GREENOUGH, and Military Notes by Professor JUDSON. 564 pages. Crown 8vo, red edges, half-morocco, 6s.

THE GATE TO THE ANABASIS. With Colloquia, Notes and Vocabulary. By C. W. GLEASON, A.M. Master in the Roxbury Latin School. Small 8vo, cloth, 2s.

**THE COLLEGE SERIES
OF GREEK AUTHORS.**

Edited under the supervision of Professor J. W. WHITE and Professor T. D. SEYMOUR.

This series comprises a number of volumes selected from the works of the best Greek authors, carefully edited for the use of University Students and the Higher Forms in Schools. Each Volume contains a full Introduction, with Notes, critical and explanatory, Rhythmical Schemes where necessary, and Appendices giving a brief Bibliography, etc.

The Volumes are uniformly bound in cloth, square 8vo.

THUCYDIDES. Book I. By Professor C. D. MORRIS. 7s. 6d.

THUCYDIDES. Book III. By Professor C. F. SMITH. 7s. 6d.

THUCYDIDES. Book V. By Professor H. N. FOWLER. 6s.

THUCYDIDES. Book VII. By Professor C. F. SMITH. 6s.

HOMER: INTRODUCTION TO LANGUAGE AND VERSE. By Professor SEYMOUR. 4s. 6d.

HOMER: ILIAD. Books I.-III. By Professor SEYMOUR. 6s.

HOMER: ILIAD. Books IV.-VI. By Professor SEYMOUR. 6s.

HOMER: ODYSSEY. Books I.-IV. By Professor FERRIN. 6s.

HOMER: ODYSSEY. Books V.-VIII. By Professor FERRIN. 6s.

PLATO: APOLOGY AND CRITO. By Professor L. DYER. 6s.

PLATO: PROTAGORAS. By Principal TOWLE. 6s.

PLATO: GORGIAS. By G. LODGE. 7s. 6d.

SOPHOCLES: ANTIGONE. By Professor DOOGÉ. 6s.

ÆSCHYLUS: PROMETHEUS VINCTUS. Wecklein's Edition. Translated by Professor ALLEN. 7s. 6d.

EURIPIDES: BACCHANTES. By Professor BECKWITH. 6s.

EURIPIDES: IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS. By Professor FLAGG. 6s.

ARISTOPHANES: THE CLOUDS. By Professor HUMPHREYS. 6s.

ÆSCHINES: IN CTESIPHONTEM. By Professor RICHARDSON. 6s.

XENOPHON: HELLENICA. Books I.-IV. By Professor MANATT. 7s. 6d.

XENOPHON: HELLENICA. Books V.-VII. By Professor BENNETT. 7s. 6d.

LYSIAS: ORATIONS. By Prof. MORGAN. 7s. 6d.

THE BEGINNER'S GREEK COMPOSITION. Based mainly upon Xenophon's Anabasis, Book I. By W. C. COLLAR and M. GRANT DANIEL. Small 8vo, cloth, 4s.

THE BEGINNER'S GREEK BOOK. By JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, Ph.D., Professor of Greek in Harvard University. Crown 8vo, half-leather, 6s. 6d.

LONDON: EDWARD ARNOLD, 37 BEDFORD STREET, STRAND.

NS

RIES
ORS.

. WHITE

ected from
ed for the
Schools.
h Notes,
re neces-
c.
e svo.

or C. D.

or C. F.

essor H.

essor C.

LAN.

4s. 6d.

rofessor

rofessor

. By

I. By

D. By

incipal

s. 6d.

rofessor

CTUS.

ALLEN.

Pro-

URIS.

S. By

M. By

I.-IV.

V.-VII.

ORGAN.

POSI-

anabasis,

DANIEL.

. By
of Greek
r, 6s. 6d.

MESSRS. MACMILLAN & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

THE PARNASSUS LIBRARY OF GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS.

P. VERGILI MARONIS BUCOLICA, GEORGICA, ÆNEIS.

Edited by T. E. PAGE, M.A., formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, Assistant Master at Charterhouse. Fcap. 8vo, 6s. net.

HOMERI ILIAS. Edited by WALTER LEAF, Litt.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Fcap. 8vo, 6s. net.

Q. HORATI FLACCI OPERA. Edited by T. E. PAGE, M.A. Fcap. 8vo, 5s. net.

TIMES.—"Students of classical literature will heartily welcome the very attractive Parnassus Library of Greek and Latin Texts, of which two volumes have been issued. . . . The volumes are handy in size, beautifully printed, and very attractively bound in a vellum cover printed with a classical design in red."

SCOTSMAN.—"Will rejoice the hearts both of scholars and of the wider body of men who, without claiming to be scholars, are able to read Latin and Greek. . . . They will be welcome on their own merits, and as raising the most hopeful expectations regarding the future volumes of the series which they introduce."

GLASGOW HERALD.—"The series appropriately begins with Homer and Virgil. The former is printed in the new Greek type, which is sure to win favour the more familiar it becomes to the reader."

SATURDAY REVIEW.—"Mr. Page has devoted his introduction to a brilliant and suggestive study of Virgil as a poet. . . . Dr. Leaf's valuable and beautiful edition."

MORNING POST.—"Great ought to be the indebtedness of all lovers of Virgil for this admirable edition of the best of Roman poets."

GUARDIAN.—"Messrs. Macmillan have sent to us a couple of charming volumes styled the Parnassus Library. . . . Mr. Leaf aims, as in his earlier edition, at giving the best text which he can get out of the manuscripts. . . . Mr. Page's Virgil is also a good text. . . . the whole book is a very pleasant one, and should find much favour in the eyes of all lovers of Virgil."

BOOKMAN.—"We have too few of such editions of the classics in England, editions the text of which satisfies the fastidious scholar, and whose externals are tasteful and attractive. This library will be the more appreciated."

ST. JAMES'S GAZETTE.—"To the scheme and fashioning of Messrs. Macmillan's new 'Parnassus Library' we may give a warm welcome. This edition of Greek and Latin authors, in its classically decorated vellum binding, at the very moderate price of six shillings, ought to 'catch on' among readers who like their Virgil, their Horace, or their Homer, as literature, and not merely as a school text with notes."

MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.—"These two volumes are the first of a series promised by Messrs. Macmillan, which might well be called 'the book-lover's editions.' Nothing could be better than the type, the paper, and the binding of white parchment, with its charming ornaments in deep brown. The names of the editors are sufficient guarantee for the excellence of the text."

HERODOTUS. The Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Books. With Introduction,

Notes, Appendices, Indices, and Maps, by REGINALD WALTER MACAN, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of University College, Oxford, and University Reader in Ancient History. In two volumes. Vol. I. Introduction, Text with Notes. Vol. II. Appendices, Index, Maps. 8vo, 16s. each volume.

Note.—The Appendices include: The Scythians of Herodotus; Geography of Scythia; The Date, Motives, and Course of the Expedition of Darius in Europe; The Persians in Thrace (512—489 B.C.); The Chronology of the Ionian Revolt; Annals of the Triennium 493—491 B.C.; Spartan History; Athens and Aigina; Inner Athenian History; Herodotus and the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία*; Marathon; the Parian Expedition; The *Libyan Logi*; The Royal Road from Susa to Sardis; Hippokleides; The Peacock.

TIMES.—"We must leave to professed scholars the detailed appreciation of Mr. Macan's performance, merely remarking that his reputation for patient scholarship and command of historical method has long been established."

GLASGOW HERALD.—"Mr. Macan takes up the middle portion of Herodotus's history, and there can be no question of his competency for the work or of the thoroughness with which he has done it. His introduction contains an exhaustive statement and on the whole a sober estimate of most of the questions that have gathered round the work of Herodotus; his commentary, is marked by correct and unusually extensive erudition, and the fourteen excursus to which the whole of the second Volume is devoted discuss, with moderation and fully adequate knowledge, a number of historical questions emerging from the text."

MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.—"The elaborate analyses included in the introduction will be most useful to the student, and what is more, Mr. Macan has succeeded for the first time in making them interesting. . . . Finally, the reader will doubtless thank Mr. Macan for the lively style in which his book is written."

MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON.

[To face last page of text.]

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

Dedicated by Gracious Permission to Her Majesty the Queen.

THE GROWTH OF BRITISH POLICY. By the late Sir J. R. SEELEY, M.A., K.C.M.G., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. With a portrait, and a memoir of the author by G. W. PROTHERO, Professor of History in the University of Edinburgh. Two Vols. Crown 8vo, 12s.

RELIQUIAE PHILOLOGICAE: OR, ESSAYS IN COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY. By the late HERBERT DUKINFELD DARBISHIRE, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Edited by R. S. CONWAY, M.A., late Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, Professor of Latin in University College, Cardiff; with a Biographical Notice by J. E. SANDYS, Litt.D., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge. Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.

THE ITALIC DIALECTS. An Edition of the remains of Oscan, Paelignian, Umbrian and the minor dialects of ancient Italy: including all inscriptions yet discovered, with critical commentary; the dialectic forms recorded in Latin and Greek sources; the Place-names and Personal names of all the dialect-areas verified and arranged; brief Historical Introductions to each section; a Conspectus of Italic Grammar (Alphabets, Accidence and Syntax); a dictionary to all the dialects; and an Appendix of explanatory notes to the longer inscriptions. By R. S. CONWAY, M.A. [*Nearly ready.*]

THE RESTORED PRONUNCIATION OF GREEK AND LATIN. With Tables and Practical Explanations. By E. V. ARNOLD, M.A., Professor of Latin in the University College of North Wales, Bangor, and R. S. CONWAY, M.A., Professor of Latin in the University of South Wales, Cardiff. Demy 8vo, 1s.

TEXTS AND STUDIES: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature.

Edited by J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, B.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity.

Vol. III., No. 2.—**THE FOURTH BOOK OF ESDRAS.** Edited from the MSS. by R. L. BENSLEY, M.A., late Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic. With an Introduction by M. R. JAMES, Litt.D., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. 5s. net.

Vol. III., No. 3.—**EUTHALIANA:** Studies of Euthalius, Codex H. Paul, and the Armenian Version. By J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, B.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity. 4s. net.

CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES.—New Volume completing the New Testament.

EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY AND TITUS. By the Rev. A. E. HUMPHREYS, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College. With Map. 3s.

CAMBRIDGE EDITIONS OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN GREEK according to the Text followed in the Authorised Version, with the variations adopted in the Revised Version. Edited by Rev. F. H. A. SCRIVENER, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s.; morocco, 12s.

New and Cheaper Edition. Fcap. 8vo, 4s. 6d.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN THE ORIGINAL GREEK, according to the Text followed in the Authorised Version, together with the Variations adopted in the Revised Version. Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, by the late F. H. A. SCRIVENER, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D.

An Edition of the same, on India Paper, is now ready, forming an exceedingly thin, compact, portable volume. Prices in leather bindings from 6s. 6d.

THE PARALLEL NEW TESTAMENT, GREEK AND ENGLISH, being the Authorised Version arranged in Parallel Columns with the Revised Version, and with the Original Greek, as edited by Rev. F. H. A. SCRIVENER, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D. Demy 8vo, cloth, 12s. 6d.; Persian morocco, 21s.; Turkey morocco, 25s.

(*The Revised Version is the Joint Property of the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford.*)

GREEK AND ENGLISH TESTAMENT, in parallel columns on the same page. Edited by J. SCHOLEFIELD, M.A., late Regius Professor of Greek in the University. Small 8vo. New Edition (with the Marginal References as arranged and revised by F. H. A. SCRIVENER, M.A., LL.D.) Cloth, red edges, 7s. 6d. Student's Edition, on large writing paper, 4to, 12s.

London: C. J. CLAY & SONS, Cambridge University Press Warehouse,
Ave Maria Lane.

R.
ge.
the

A-
St.
ius
by
of

n,
ed,
and
ach
the
A.
N.
the
the

om
by

H.
of
ent.
E.

ext
by

K,
the
A.
able

G-
with
oth,

on
ity.
A.
per,

se,

CHARLES GRIFFIN & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS.

Now ready, with Frontispiece and Illustrations, handsome cloth, 16s.

A MANUAL OF GREEK ANTIQUITIES.

For the Use of Students and General Readers.

PERCY GARDNER,

M.A., Litt.D.,
Lincoln Prof. of Class. Archaeology and Art in
the University of Oxford.

BY

AND

F. B. JEVONS,

M.A., Litt.D.,
University of Durham.

General Contents:—Surroundings of Greek Life—Religion and Mythology—Cultus—Course of Life—Commerce—Constitutional and Legal Antiquities—Slavery—War—The Theatre.

ROMAN ANTIQUITIES (A MANUAL OF). By WILLIAM RAMSAY, M.A., late Professor of Humanity in the University of Glasgow. Revised and Edited by RODOLFO LANCIANI, D.C.L. Oxon., LL.D., &c., Professor of Classical Topography in the University of Rome. FIFTEENTH EDITION. 10s. 6d.

"The chief interest in the New Edition centres in the chapter on ROMAN TOPOGRAPHY, which has been entirely re-written by Prof. LANCIANI, the greatest living authority on this subject. . . . It is the BEST and HANDIEST guide yet produced."—*Athenæum*.

PREHISTORIC ANTIQUITIES OF THE ARYAN PEOPLES. A Manual of Comparative Philology and the Earliest Culture. By Dr. O. SCHRADER, of Jena. Translated from the SECOND GERMAN EDITION by F. B. JEVONS, M.A., Litt.D. In large 8vo, handsome cloth, 21s.

"DR. SCHRADER'S GREAT WORK."—*The Times*.

"It would be hard to find any book more to be recommended to the early student in Philology and Prehistoric Archaeology."
—*Classical Review*.

A HISTORY OF GREEK LITERATURE. From the Earliest Period to the Death of Demosthenes. By F. B. JEVONS, M.A., Litt.D. SECOND EDITION. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

"Beyond all question the BEST HISTORY of Greek literature published."—*Spectator*.

"Mr. Jevons' work is distinguished by the Author's THOROUGH ACQUAINTANCE WITH THE OLD WRITERS. . . . His great merit lies in his EXCELLENT EXPOSITION of the POLITICAL and SOCIAL CAUSES concerned in the development of the Literature of Greece."—*Berlin Philologische Wochenschrift*.

A HISTORY OF ROMAN LITERATURE. From the Earliest Period to the Times of the Antonines. By the Rev. C. T. CRUTTWELL, M.A., formerly Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. FIFTH EDITION. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

"Mr. CRUTTWELL has done a REAL SERVICE to all students of the Latin language and literature. . . . FULL of good scholarship and good criticism."—*Athenæum*.

"A most serviceable—indeed, indispensable—guide for the student. . . . The 'general reader' will be both charmed and instructed."—*Saturday Review*.

SPECIMENS OF ROMAN LITERATURE: Prose Writers and Poets. From the Earliest Period to the Times of the Antonines. Part I. ROMAN THOUGHT: Religion, Philosophy, Art, 6s.; Part II. ROMAN STYLE: Descriptive, Rhetorical, Humorous, 5s. Crown 8vo, cloth. SECOND EDITION. Edited by C. T. CRUTTWELL, M.A., Merton College, Oxford, and PEAKE BANTON, M.A., sometime Scholar of Jesus College, Oxford.

"A work which is not only useful but necessary. The sound judgment exercised in plan and selection calls for hearty commendation."—*Saturday Review*.

"KEY to PART II, PERIOD II., may now be had (by Tutors only) on application to the Publishers. Price 2s. 6d."

A LITERARY HISTORY OF EARLY CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. C. T. CRUTTWELL, M.A., formerly Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. In Two Vols. Demy 8vo, handsome cloth, 21s.

"Mr. Cruttwell has accomplished his task with REMARKABLE SUCCESS. His History is EMINENTLY READABLE. . . . ABOUNDS in eloquent passages."—*Athenæum*.

"The Author has accomplished his task ADMIRABLY. I do not know how more could be offered to the general reader than is contained in these 650 pages."—Professor A. HARNACK in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*.

"The Sections on the Apostolic Fathers, the Apologists, and the Alexandrian writers are VERY SUCCESSFUL and full of instruction. The translations which enrich the work—the *Didache*, the Letter from the Churches of Lyon and Vienne, and the extracts from the lately discovered 'Gospel of Peter'—will certainly be heartily welcomed by many readers."—*Theologisches Literaturblatt*.

THE VOCABULARY OF PHILOSOPHY; or, Student's Book of Reference.

On the basis of Prof. FLEMING's Vocabulary. Re-constructed and partly Re-written by HENRY CALDERWOOD, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. FIFTH EDITION, 10s. 6d.

STANDARD ILLUSTRATED CLASSICS.

BRYCE (Archibald Hamilton, D.C.L., LL.D., Senior Classical Moderator in the University of Dublin):

The Works of Virgil. Text from HEYNE and WAGNER. English Notes, original, and selected from the leading German and English Commentators. Illustrations from the antique. Complete in one volume. Fourteenth Edition. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 6s.

Or, in Three Parts:—Part I. BUCCOLICS and GEORGICS, 2s. 6d.

Part II. THE *ÆNEID*, Books I.—VI., 2s. 6d.

Part III. THE *ÆNEID*, Books VII.—XII., 2s. 6d.

"Contains the pith of what has been written by the best scholars on the subject. The notes comprise everything that the student can want."—*Athenæum*.

CURRIE (Joseph, Formerly Head Classical Master of Glasgow Academy):

The Works of Horace: Text from ORELLIUS. English Notes, original, and selected from the best Commentators. Illustrations from the antique. Complete in One Volume. Fcap. 8vo. Cloth, 5s.

Or in Two Parts:—Part I.—*CARMINA*, 3s.

Part II. *SATIRES AND EPISTLES*, 3s.

"The notes are excellent and exhaustive."—*Quarterly Journal of Education*.

LONDON: CHARLES GRIFFIN & CO., LTD., EXETER STREET, STRAND.

CLARENDON PRESS LIST.

Just Published, demy 8vo, half-bound, with 3 Facsimiles, 10s. 6d. net.

THE UTOPIA OF SIR THOMAS MORE. In Latin from the Edition of March, 1518, and in English from the First Edition of Ralph Robynson's Translation in 1551. With Additional Translations, Introduction, and Notes. By J. H. LUPTON, B.D., Surmaster of St. Paul's School and Preacher of Gray's Inn, formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

"A very complete and scholarly edition of Sir Thomas More's celebrated treatise, in which the editor has attempted, and not unsuccessfully, in our judgment, to treat it with something of the exact care that is looked for in editing a classical author."—*Times*.

Crown 8vo, cloth, 7s. 6d.

LECTURES AND ESSAYS. (Second Series.) By HENRY NETTLESHIP, M.A., D.Litt., late Corpus Professor of Latin Literature in the University of Oxford. Edited by F. HAVERFIELD, M.A., Student of Christ Church. With Portrait and Memoir by Mrs. NETTLESHIP.

"Apart from their intrinsic merit and interest as the work of one of the most accomplished Latin scholars of our time, these papers are marked by the wide learning and fine literary judgment of their author."—*Times*.

Already Published, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

LECTURES AND ESSAYS ON SUBJECTS CONNECTED WITH LATIN SCHOLARSHIP AND LITERATURE. By the Same Author.

Crown 8vo, paper covers, 3s.

A FIRST CATECHISM OF TAMIL GRAMMAR. By the Rev. G. V. POPE, D.D., Balliol College, Oxford, sometime Fellow of the Madras University. With an English Translation by the Rev. D. S. HERRICK, B.A., Madras, and English Notes by the Author.

Extra fcap. 8vo, Third Edition.

LATIN PROSE COMPOSITION. By GEORGE G. RAMSAY, M.A., LL.D.

Vol. I., in Two Parts, Just Published, 2s. 6d. each:—

Vol. I. Part I. **THE SIMPLE SENTENCE.**

Vol. I. Part II. **THE COMPOUND SENTENCE.**

Vol. II. **CONTAINING PASSAGES FOR TRANSLATION INTO LATIN.** 4s. 6d.

ROMAN POETS OF THE REPUBLIC. By W. Y. SELLAR, M.A.
Third Edition, crown 8vo, 10s.

ROMAN POETS OF THE AUGUSTAN AGE. VIRGIL. By W. Y. SELLAR, M.A. Second Edition, crown 8vo, 9s.

— **HORACE AND THE ELEGIAC POETS.** By W. Y. SELLAR, M.A. With a Memoir of the Author by ANDREW LANG, M.A., and a Portrait. 8vo, cloth, 14s.

Parts I.—V. now ready, small 4to, paper covers, 2s. 6d. each.

A HEBREW AND ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. With an Appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic, based on the Thesaurus and Lexicon of GESENIUS, by FRANCIS BROWN, D.D., S. R. DRIVER, D.D., and C. A. BRIGGS, D.D.

FULL CATALOGUES POST FREE ON APPLICATION.

LONDON: HENRY FROWDE, CLARENDON PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED, LONDON AND BUNGAY.

ST.

et.

from the
Translation in
PTON, B.D.,
John's College,

the editor has
sought care that is

ETTLESHIP.

Edited by F.
ETTLESHIP.

Latin scholars
author."

—Times.

NECTED

the Rev.
ty. With an
the Author.

AY, M.A.,

N. 4s. 6d.

LAR, M.A.

PHIL. By

F. SELLAR,
cloth, 14s.

THE OLD

Thesaurus and
A. BRIGGS,

ORNER, E.C.